

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 193) was unanimously agreed to.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, on Friday next, November 2, 1973, the Senate will convene at 10 a.m.

After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes; after which the distinguished assistant Republican leader (Mr. GRIFFIN) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes; after which the junior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes; at the conclusion of which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

At the conclusion of routine morning business, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 1769. There is no time limitation thereon. Amendments thereto are expected. There will be a yea-and-

no vote on final passage of S. 1769 on Friday next. The yeas and nays have already been ordered.

Hopefully, conferences between the two Houses can proceed in the meantime, tomorrow and Thursday. Several conferences are still out, among which are the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill conference report, the State-Justice appropriation bill conference report, conference reports on the military procurement authorization, foreign assistance amendments, foreign military assistance, and military construction authorizations.

So this respite will give the Senate conferees the opportunity to be away from the floor without the conferences being interrupted by rollcall votes.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M., FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1973

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, with the concurrence of the distinguished majority whip, I move, in accordance with the previous order, and pursuant to Senate Resolution 193, as a further mark of respect to the memory of Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, that

the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to, and, at 5:12 p.m., the Senate adjourned until Friday, November 2, 1973, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 30, 1973:

U.S. PATENT OFFICE

The following named persons to be Examiners-in-Chief, U.S. Patent Office:

Roger L. Campbell, of Virginia, vice John Stevens Lieb, resigned.

Walter W. Burns, Jr., of Virginia, vice Don D. Andrews, resigned.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 30, 1973:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Alvan C. Gillem II, FR (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 30, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Tipton L. Britner, Immanuel United Methodist Church, Indianapolis, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Our God and Father, we give thanks for our Nation, for all its natural beauty and abundance of raw materials. Give us wisdom to use them wisely. Be with our legislators as they debate actions that will have profound influence on the lives of millions of people. Grant them the courage to act on conviction and not expediency, to stand firm for what they believe is right. When they are right give them the victory, and when they are wrong, let them be defeated. Let truth be the standard and love be the guide that governs all actions taken this day. Let not foolish pride or a stubborn will influence their decisions. Lead us out of the pressure of crisis and confusion in order that we may find simplicity. In Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On October 16, 1973:

H.J. Res. 727. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes.

On October 18, 1973:

H.R. 1965. An act for the relief of Theodore Barr;

H.R. 7645. An act to authorize appropriations for the Department of State, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7976. An act to amend the act of August 31, 1965, commemorating certain historical events in the State of Kansas.

On October 19, 1973:

H.R. 1322. An act for the relief of Jay Alexis Caligdong Siaotong;

H.R. 1366. An act for the relief of Juan Marcos Cordova-Campos;

H.R. 1377. An act for the relief of Michael Joseph Wendt;

H.R. 1462. An act for the relief of John R. Poe;

H.R. 1716. An act for the relief of Jean Albertina Service Gordon;

H.R. 2212. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nguyen Thi Le Flintland and Susan Flintland;

H.R. 2215. An act for the relief of Mrs. Purita Paningbatan Bohannon;

H.R. 6628. An act to amend section 101(b) of the Micronesian Claims Act of 1971 to enlarge the class of persons eligible to receive benefits under the claims program established by that act;

H.R. 7699. An act to provide for the filling of vacancies in the Legislature of the Virgin Islands;

H.R. 1315. An act for the relief of Jesse McCarver, Georgia Villa McCarver, Kathy McCarver, and Edith McCarver;

H.R. 1378. An act for the relief of James E. Bashline; and

H.R. 4507. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of Jim Thorpe.

On October 25, 1973:

H.R. 3799. An act to liberalize eligibility for cost-of-living increases in civil service retirement annuities; and

H.R. 8619. An act making appropriations for agriculture-environmental and consumer

protection programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

On October 26, 1973:

H.J. Res. 748. Joint resolution making an appropriation for special payments to international financial institutions for the fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8250. An act to authorize certain programs and activities of the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8825. An act making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, and corporations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

REV. TIPTON L. BRITNER OF INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

(Mr. HUDNUT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to say that the opening prayer for today's session was delivered by my very good friend, and former colleague in the ministry, Rev. Tipton L. Britner, senior minister of Immanuel United Methodist Church, Indianapolis, Ind. Reverend Britner's prayer was sincere, meaningful, and appropriate and I am sure that I speak for all of us in welcoming him and expressing appreciation to him for being with us today.

In addition to his pastoral duties, Reverend Britner is well known in Indianapolis for his many civic endeavors in behalf of his fellowman. He is director of the North Arlington Multiservice Project which includes the Beechwood Gardens Housing Project, the Immanuel Day Care Center which serves over 100 children daily—and the Immanuel Coun-

selling Center. These various projects provide some 15,000 units of service per month for the northeast side of the city and are partially funded by Community Services Program of Greater Indianapolis. Reverend Britner is very much an authority on day care services for children as well as other needed social services.

It is a great pleasure to have him with us today.

MR. GERALD FORD

(Mr. BRINKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the paper yesterday where 70 extra FBI agents had been assigned to Grand Rapids, the hometown of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) as part of the investigation into his background following his selection by President Nixon to become Vice President. This is ridiculous. It borders on hysteria.

THE MILITARY ALL-VOLUNTEER CONCEPT—EIGHTH SEGMENT

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, to continue my 1-minute speeches, I have received a letter from the Secretary of the Army, Bo Callaway, asking my support as the Army faces one of its most serious challenges—the volunteer concept.

Secretary Callaway admits that the strength quotas have not been met by the Army, but in his letter he points out that other new objectives are being obtained.

Mr. Speaker, I and all my colleagues are certainly willing to help the Secretary of the Army make the volunteer concept work. However, I would caution the Secretary to keep his powder dry and not be carried away by new motivated ideas. If the volunteer concept is not going to work, the Secretary has the responsibility of letting Congress know. We must continue to have a strong and viable Army.

CHARLES G. OAKMAN

(Mrs. GRIFFITHS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform you of the passing of former Congressman Charles G. Oakman. Mr. Oakman was my predecessor in the House, serving Michigan's 17th Congressional District in the 83d Congress.

Mr. Oakman was a fine man, highly respected in the Detroit metropolitan area. He came from one of Detroit's most prominent families, known for its public service and contributions to the development of the city.

At this time, I would like to extend my sympathies to Mr. Oakman's widow and family, and insert in this RECORD his

obituaries carried in the Detroit News and the Detroit Free Press.

The article follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press, Oct. 29, 1973]

CHARLES G. OAKMAN, 70, IS DEAD

Charles G. Oakman, a long-time Detroit politician and the man who, as much as anyone, was responsible for the construction of the City-County Building, died in his sleep at his Dearborn home Sunday. He was 70.

A descendant of the Oakman family which held extensive real estate and development interests in the city, Mr. Oakman worked in real estate and life insurance for 14 years after his graduation from the University of Michigan before entering public service.

In 1940 he became the executive secretary to Mayor Edward Jeffries Jr. and the next year was appointed city controller.

He resigned in 1945 to become a member of the Common Council, to which he was elected four times. He resigned his council position in 1952 after winning a seat in Congress, representing the 17th Congressional District in northwest Detroit as a Republican.

Mr. Oakman lost his bid for re-election in 1954, and returned to Detroit to become the general manager of the Detroit-Wayne Joint Building Authority, which he had been instrumental in creating eight years earlier while a councilman.

He held that position until early this year, when he retired. Mr. Oakman continued to work as a consultant and advisor to the authority and was often seen around the City-County Building, ready at the drop of a hat to tell a story from his insider days in city and federal government.

He served 11 years as a county supervisor.

Mr. Oakman was a member of the Elks, the Palestine Chapter of the Palestine Lodge, Moslem Shrine, Detroit Commandery No. 1 of Knights Templar, and the University of Michigan Club. He was a former trustee of the Detroit Institute of Cancer Research.

He is survived by his wife, Bernice; two children from his marriage to Mary Atherton, Charles R. Oakman and Patricia Ashbrook; one sister and six grandchildren. Services will be at 11 a.m. Wednesday at the Howe-Peterson Funeral Home, 22546 Michigan Ave., Dearborn. Burial will be in Roseland Park, Berkley.

Memorial tributes in lieu of flowers may be sent to the Capuchin Charity Guild of Detroit.

[From the Detroit News, Oct. 29, 1973]

CHARLES G. OAKMAN, EX-COUNCILMAN, DIES

Charles G. (Charlie) Oakman, former U.S. congressman, Detroit city councilman and for 17 years "landlord" of the City-County Building, died yesterday in Oakwood Hospital at the age of 70.

Mr. Oakman served four terms on the City Council and one term in the U.S. House but was perhaps best known for his leadership in forming the Detroit-Wayne Joint Building Authority, which in 1955 completed the City-County Building in downtown Detroit.

Having helped build the "dream city hall", Mr. Oakman was the natural choice to serve as its building manager and unofficial ambassador of good will. He held that job until his retirement last year.

Mr. Oakman took to politics by heritage and environment.

He was born in Detroit's Corktown to a family whose political, real estate and development activities were prominent in the city in the late 1800's.

And, as the nephew of a former Wayne County sheriff, auditor and clerk, Mr. Oakman often said he cut his teeth on how votes are won and lost and won again.

After graduating in 1926 from the University of Michigan, where he wrote his senior thesis on "Detroit's Strong Mayor Type of

Government", Mr. Oakman opened a real estate firm but kept his hand in politics by campaigning for former Detroit Mayor John C. Lodge and serving as campaign manager to another former Detroit mayor, Edward J. Jeffries.

During the Jeffries campaign, Mr. Oakman invited hundreds to a "cocktail" party to meet the candidate. "But Charlie," Jeffries said, "we're short of campaign funds." "All right," said Mr. Oakman, "let them drink beer. It'll be something new at a cocktail party."

Known for his straightforward style, Mr. Oakman was a favorite of the press. Rising to deliver a campaign speech at the beer party for Jeffries, Mr. Oakman described himself as a "Jeffries Red Hot. I admire Jeffries' honesty and forthrightness. What more do you fellows want?"

Mr. Oakman served as Mayor Jeffries' executive secretary and then as city controller until winning his first Council seat in 1946. He moved to the U.S. House in 1952 as a Republican from the 17th District, but lost his bid for re-election in 1954.

After that he became building manager at the new City-County Building where he administered a \$2 million annual budget and supervised a staff of 140.

Services for Mr. Oakman will be at 11 a.m. Wednesday in Howe Peterson Funeral Home, 22546 Michigan, Dearborn. Burial will be in Roseland Park.

Surviving are his wife, Bernice; a son, Charles R.; a daughter, Mrs. Charles Ashbrook; a sister, Mrs. Walter Reichart; and six grandchildren.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days to revise and extend their remarks on the passing of former Congressman Charles G. Oakman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I was saddened, and felt very sorry that my old friend, Charles Oakman, passed away.

He served well, as I recall, just one term in the House. He came to the Congress in 1952 after a very illustrious career in local politics in the city of Detroit. He served extremely well in the House of Representatives and when he left the House he continued his fine public service in the community.

He was a good friend of mine.

After he left the Congress he kept his interest not only in local public affairs but in political matters at the Federal level and it was always at the constructive level.

I extend to his family my deepest condolences in the hour of sadness.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG).

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, this is the first I have known of the passing of my good friend Charley Oakman.

We came together to the 83d Congress. We were very close friends.

He came from a very illustrious Detroit family and has been active in the affairs of the city of Detroit for many years.

I want to join others in expressing my very deep regret and sadness at his passing and to express my sympathy to his family.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I thank the gentleman.

I am sure I speak for all when I extend the sympathies of the House of Representatives to his family.

PENDING HEARING BEFORE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

(Mr. PREYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, the House Judiciary Committee will soon begin one of the most important congressional investigations ever undertaken. In order to insure that this investigation is fair and thorough it is imperative that the Committee have access to whatever information it may need.

There is, however, a very real obstacle facing the investigatory function of Congress. I refer to the decision of October 17 by Chief Judge John Sirica of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. In denying the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities access to what have become known as the Watergate tapes, Judge Sirica found that the court had no jurisdiction to hear the case. In Judge Sirica's words—

The Court has here been requested to invoke a jurisdiction which only Congress can grant but which Congress has heretofore withheld.

I am today introducing legislation which clearly gives the District Court for the District of Columbia jurisdiction to enforce congressional subpoenas. While this legislation is in no way inconsistent with the establishment of a special prosecutor acting outside Congress, it is at the same time essential to arm House and Senate Committees with the power to conduct complete investigations. I strongly urge that we proceed with all dispatch in enacting this legislation.

Similar legislation is being introduced today in the Senate by Senator ERVIN

ACADEMY APPOINTMENTS

(Mr. MILFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the great pleasures of serving as a Congressman is have the opportunity of nominating fine young people to attend our three U.S. service academies at West Point, Annapolis, and Colorado Springs. I believe that the outstanding youth of our country should be recognized for their achievements and capabilities, and I am extremely pleased to be able to do so through the conferring of these nominations.

Last year I was privileged to nominate

two young men, Charles Tankersley to the Air Force Academy and Scott Smith to the Naval Academy. It was brought to my attention recently that after their first summer's work both distinguished themselves by participating in the most outstanding company for that period of time—Charles in the Honor Squadron and Scott in the Color Company. I cannot tell you how pleased and proud I am of their achievement.

We are now in the process of selecting this year's nominees, a procedure which should require our thoughtful and careful deliberation. I, for one, am very appreciative of having the chance to assist in a very real way these fine young people in the pursuit of their future goals and career objectives. I strongly believe that they will prove to be of great benefit, not only in their area of work but to our Nation as well.

CONFIRMATION PROCEEDINGS ON THE NOMINATION OF VICE-PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE GERALD R. FORD

(Mr. RIEGLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice to others calling for swift action on the confirmation proceedings of Vice-President-designate GERALD R. FORD.

While the full investigative process must be properly completed, I feel it is essential that we bring his confirmation to a vote in the House at the earliest moment.

I wish to declare today my support for his confirmation, and I do so with full knowledge that, if confirmed, he may well ascend to the Presidency within a short time.

In candor, he was not my first choice for this job. We have had many fundamental differences on key issues. Nevertheless, I believe he has the personal integrity and the basic competence to function effectively as President.

Some ask if he can rise above partisanship to assume a national office representing Americans of all viewpoints. I believe he can. Others ask if he will be able to help restore the people's faith in government. Only on-the-job performance can finally answer this, but I believe in his honesty and know him to be a man of deep personal integrity.

While JERRY FORD is a friend, I do not rise today as a matter of friendship; I rise to add my own insight and personal judgment on a matter that is of critical importance to our country.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE APPOINTMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN BUCHANAN AS MEMBER OF U.S. DELEGATION TO THE U.N.

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am requesting a leave of absence through the remainder of the 28th ses-

sion of the United Nations for the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) who is a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations and has been serving in this position since September 18.

I wish my colleague well in New York and commend our President for his selection of Mr. BUCHANAN to this position at this particularly critical time in the history of international relations.

POSTPONEMENT OF CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGE ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 542, WAR POWERS RESOLUTION, UNTIL WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the veto message of the President on House Joint Resolution 542 be further postponed until Wednesday, November 7, 1973.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask what is the gentleman's request?

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the request is concerning a postponement of consideration of the veto message on the war powers resolution, which is scheduled for Thursday. In view of the fact that Congressman Saylor's funeral is going to be on that day, we are asking for the postponement.

Mr. GROSS. The postponement would be until Wednesday next?

Mr. O'NEILL. Until Wednesday next.

Mr. GROSS. Does that also include the USIA and that sort of thing?

Mr. O'NEILL. That is for the other body, as far as my knowledge is concerned.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

QUARTERLY REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC STABILIZATION PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

I herewith transmit to the Congress the most recent Quarterly Report of the Economic Stabilization Program, covering the period April 1, 1973, through June 30, 1973.

The second quarter of 1973 was a time of tremendous growth for the American economy. Employment increased by over one million jobs. Our gross national product grew by \$29.5 billion and real per capita disposable income reached a new high. On the international front, our balance of payments continued to im-

prove significantly according to all major measures of the payments deficit. The basic balance deficit was reduced to an annual rate of slightly more than \$3 billion in this period, as compared to a deficit rate of \$9.8 billion for all of 1972.

Unfortunately, during this same period the rate of inflation continued its unsatisfactory rise. This increase reflected a strong growth in demand—both here at home and around the world—particularly for agricultural and petroleum products.

Accordingly, I decided to institute a 60-day freeze on prices beginning June 13. At the same time, I directed that plans be developed for a new phase of the Economic Stabilization Program. Phase IV, which was developed in extensive consultation with representatives of all segments of our economy, is now in effect.

I am convinced that Phase IV, combined with actions to increase supplies, a restrictive monetary policy, and restraint in Federal spending, will enable us to reduce the inflationary threat to our economic well-being.

With the cooperation of business, labor and the American public, we can achieve our goal of reasonable price stability and return our country to a strong and healthy free market system.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 30, 1973.

REPORT ON HIGHWAY SAFETY— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93-173)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Ever since the Highway Safety and the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Acts were passed in 1966, the fatality rate on our Nation's highways has been falling. In 1967, the number of deaths per 100 million miles driven was 5.5. By 1972 it had dropped by 18 percent to 4.5.

A wide range of programs have contributed to this decrease, programs designed to increase the safety of our highways, our motor vehicles and the driving habits of our motorists. The full impact of many of these safety programs still has not been felt, and there is reason for us to expect still greater progress in the future.

Unfortunately, the success we have enjoyed in reducing the fatality rate has not been extended to reducing the total number of highway deaths. In 1967, 53,000 persons died in motor vehicle accidents of various kinds. By 1972 that annual toll had risen to an estimated 57,000—a truly shocking level.

The discrepancy between the falling rate of fatalities and the rising number of deaths is explained, of course, by the fact that the number of vehicle miles driven in this country increased by more

than 300 billion between 1967 and 1972. The total mileage driven in 1972 was 1.25 trillion. In short, our safety measures, effective as they have been, have not been able to hold in check the total number of highway deaths occasioned by the vastly greater use of our highways.

My Administration is profoundly committed to the cause of highway safety. The annual toll which traffic accidents take in lives and in injuries is more than any society should have to bear. And the annual financial cost of traffic accidents is now estimated at nearly \$50 billion.

It is my hope that this three-volume report on the Highway Safety and National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Acts of 1966, by reviewing the challenge of traffic safety and by detailing our efforts to meet it, will increase our awareness and enhance our effectiveness in this vital field.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 30, 1973.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED RE- PORTS

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING THE DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 656 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 656

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9456) to extend the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 for three years. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, and all points of order against section 2 of said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI are hereby waived. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes for the minority to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN) and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 656 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 9456, a bill to extend the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 for 3 years.

House Resolution 656 provides that it shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

House Resolution 656 also provides for a waiver of points of order against section 2 of the substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI, of the Rules of the House of Representatives—prohibiting appropriations in a legislative bill.

H.R. 9456 authorizes an appropriation of \$26 million for fiscal year 1974, \$30 million for fiscal year 1975, and \$34 million for fiscal year 1976, for a total authorization of \$90 million over the next 3 fiscal years. These moneys will be divided and allocated to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to fund drug abuse education programs and to support community education projects. They will also be allocated to the State education agencies in order for such agencies to assist local education agencies in the planning, development, and implementation of drug abuse education programs.

Mr. Speaker, the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 has made progress toward alleviating the problems of inadequate scientific materials for the teaching at all levels of society about the dangers of drug use and abuse, and the lack of adequately trained teachers. However, the drug abuse problem is still significant, and there is still a continued national need for a program to better educate the citizenry about the uses and potential abuses of drugs. I urge adoption of House Resolution 656 in order that we may discuss and debate H.R. 9456.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the primary purpose of H.R. 9456 is to extend for 3 years the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970.

The funds authorized would be used for drug abuse education proposals and community education projects.

The total cost of this program is \$90,000,000 over the 3-year period. The costs are broken down in the following chart:

	[In millions]		
	Fiscal year—		
	1973	1974	1975
Sec. 3—Drug abuse education projects.....	\$14	\$16	\$18
Sec. 4—Community education projects.....	12	14	16
Total.....	26	30	34

There are no departmental letters in the committee report. However, the re-

port does indicate that administration witnesses opposed this bill in their testimony before the committee. These witnesses maintained that the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 already contains sufficient flexibility so that the Director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare can conduct drug abuse education programs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUILLEN. I will be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman from Tennessee give us any indication as to why there is no provision in this bill to deal with coffee abuse education? Does not the gentleman from Tennessee think that there is abuse on the part of some people in the drinking of coffee, and is caffeine a drug?

Mr. QUILLEN. I imagine it could be covered under the wide provisions of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder why coffee is not covered in this \$90 million bill to educate people about the sad story of those who drink too much coffee.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUILLEN. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I might say that caffeine is a drug, as the gentleman from Tennessee has quite accurately stated, and it could of course be included under the bill if it were demonstrated that the abuse of the use of caffeine were regarded by particular applicants as something they wanted to provide education about. But I would have to point out to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) that the principal impetus for this program came of course not because of the misuse or abuse of caffeine, but of drugs such as heroin, cocaine, and other dangerous drugs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that we ought to short circuit any segment or any category of society when it comes to education. We are educating people on the environment, the other day we passed a bill with \$189 million worth of the taxpayers' money to cover that, and now we are confronted with \$90 million worth of education for a couple of purposes under the terms of this bill. So I do not know why we should not go all the way.

For instance, I am informed that if children drink too much Coca-Cola at an early age it tends to cause tooth decay, so why should we not have an educational program with regard to that abuse as well as people who abuse the drinking of coffee?

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa has made a good point. And I would say if it is not covered under this act that eventually there will be a recommendation to expend millions more for additional educational programs.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and for his usual pertinent remarks.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 376, nays 4, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 553]

YEAS—376

Abdnor	Conte	Ginn
Abzug	Conyers	Goldwater
Adams	Corman	Gonzalez
Adabbo	Cotter	Goodling
Alexander	Coughlin	Green, Pa.
Anderson, Ill.	Crane	Griffiths
Andrews, N.C.	Cronin	Grover
Andrews,	Culver	Gude
N. Dak.	Daniel, Dan	Guyer
Annunzio	Daniel, Robert	Haley
Archer	W. Jr.	Hamilton
Arends	Daniels	Hanley
Armstrong	Dominick V.	Hanna
Ashbrook	Danielson	Hanrahan
Ashley	Davis, Ga.	Hansen, Idaho
Bafalis	Davis, S.C.	Harrington
Baker	Davis, Wis.	Harsha
Barrett	de la Garza	Harvey
Bauman	Delaney	Hastings
Beard	Dellenback	Hawkins
Bennett	Dennholm	Hays
Bergland	Dennis	Hebert
Beverly	Derwinski	Hechler, W. Va.
Blester	Devine	Heckler, Mass.
Bingham	Diggs	Heinz
Blackburn	Dingell	Helstoski
Boggs	Donohue	Henderson
Bolling	Dorn	Hicks
Bowen	Downing	Hillis
Brademas	Drinan	Hinshaw
Brasco	Dulski	Hogan
Bray	Duncan	Holifield
Breckinridge	du Pont	Holt
Brinkley	Eckhardt	Holtzman
Broomfield	Edwards, Ala.	Horton
Brotzman	Edwards, Calif.	Huber
Brown, Calif.	Ellberg	Hudnut
Brown, Mich.	Erlenborn	Hungate
Brown, Ohio	Esch	Hunt
Broyhill, N.C.	Eshleman	Hutchinson
Bryner	Evans, Colo.	Ichord
Burke, Fla.	Evins, Tenn.	Jarman
Burgener	Fascell	Johnson, Calif.
Burke, Mass.	Findley	Johnson, Colo.
Burleson, Tex.	Fish	Johnson, Pa.
Burlison, Mo.	Fisher	Jones, N.C.
Burton	Flood	Jones, Okla.
Butler	Flowers	Jones, Tenn.
Byron	Flynt	Jordan
Camp	Foley	Karth
Carney, Ohio	Ford, Gerald R.	Kastenmeier
Carter	Ford,	Kazen
Casey, Tex.	William D.	Kemp
Cederberg	Forsythe	Ketchum
Chamberlain	Fraser	Kluczynski
Chappell	Frelinghuysen	Koch
Clancy	Frenzel	Kuykendall
Clay	Frey	Kyros
Cleveland	Froehlich	Landrum
Cochran	Fulton	Latta
Cohen	Fuqua	Leggett
Collier	Gaydos	Lehman
Collins, Ill.	Gettys	Lent
Collins, Tex.	Gialmo	Litton
Conable	Gibbons	Long, La.
Conlan	Gilman	Long, Md.

Lott	Pike	Steed
McClory	Poage	Steelman
McCollister	Podell	Steiger, Ariz.
McCormack	Powell, Ohio	Steiger, Wis.
McDade	Preyer	Stevens
McEwen	Price, Ill.	Stokes
McFall	Price, Tex.	Stubblefield
McKay	Pritchard	Stuckey
McSpadden	Quile	Studds
Madden	Railsback	Sullivan
Madigan	Randall	Symms
Mahon	Rangel	Talcott
Maillard	Rees	Taylor, Mo.
Mallory	Regula	Taylor, N.C.
Mann	Reid	Teague, Calif.
Maraziti	Reuss	Teague, Tex.
Martin, Nebr.	Rhodes	Thompson, N.J.
Martin, N.C.	Riegle	Thompson, Wis.
Mathias, Calif.	Rinaldo	Thone
Mathis, Ga.	Robinson, Va.	Thornton
Matsunaga	Robison, N.Y.	Tiernan
Mayne	Rodino	Towell, Nev.
Mazzoli	Roe	Treen
Meeds	Rogers	Udall
Melcher	Roncalio, Wyo.	Ullman
Metcalfe	Roncalio, N.Y.	Van Deerlin
Mezvinsky	Rooney, N.Y.	Vander Jagt
Michel	Rooney, Pa.	Vanik
Milford	Rose	Vigorito
Miller	Rosenthal	Waggonner
Minish	Rostenkowski	Walsh
Mink	Roush	Wampler
Minshall, Ohio	Rousselot	Ware
Mitchell, Md.	Roybal	Whalen
Mitchell, N.Y.	Ruppe	White
Mizell	Ruth	Whitehurst
Moakley	St Germain	Whitten
Molohan	Sarasin	Widnall
Montgomery	Sarbanes	Williams
Moorhead,	Satterfield	Wilson, Bob
Calif.	Scherle	Wilson,
Moorhead, Pa.	Schneebeil	Charles H.,
Morgan	Schroeder	Calif.
Moss	Sebellus	Wilson,
Murphy, Ill.	Seiberling	Charles, Tex.
Myers	Shipley	Winn
Natcher	Shoup	Wolf
Nedzi	Shriver	Wright
Nelsen	Shuster	Wyatt
Obey	Sikes	Wyder
O'Brien	Sisk	Wylie
O'Hara	Skubitz	Wyman
O'Neill	Slack	Yates
Owens	Smith, Iowa	Yatron
Parris	Smith, N.Y.	Young, Alaska
Passman	Snyder	Young, Ga.
Patman	Spence	Young, Ill.
Patten	Staggers	Young, S.C.
Pepper	Stanton	Young, Tex.
Perkins	J. William	Zablocki
Pettis	Stanton,	Zion
Peyser	James V.	Zwack
Pickle	Stark	

NAYS—4

Gross	Quillen	Rarick
Landgrebe		

NOT VOTING—53

Anderson,	Dent	Macdonald
Calif.	Dickinson	Mills, Ark.
Aspin	Fountain	Mosher
Badillo	Grasso	Murphy, N.Y.
Bell	Gray	Nichols
Blaggi	Green, Oreg.	Nix
Blatnik	Gubser	Roberts
Boland	Gunter	Roy
Breaux	Hammer-	Runnels
Brooks	schmidt	Ryan
Buchanan	Hansen, Wash.	Sandman
Burke, Calif.	Hosmer	Steele
Carey, N.Y.	Howard	Stratton
Chisholm	Jones, Ala.	Symington
Clark	Keating	Veysey
Clausen,	King	Waldie
Don H.	Lujan	Wiggins
Clawson, Del	McCloskey	Young, Fla.
Dellums	McKinney	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dent with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mrs. Burke of California.
 Mr. Nichols with Mr. Breaux.
 Mr. Fountain with Mr. Runnels.
 Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Dellums.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Mosher.
 Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Del Clawson.
 Mr. Howard with Mr. King.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Buchanan.
 Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Keating.
 Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Lujan.
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Aspin.
 Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Sandman.
 Mr. Nix with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. Roberts with Mr. Steele.
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Waldie with Mr. McKinney.
 Mr. Symington with Mr. Gubser.
 Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Dickinson.
 Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Ryan.
 Mr. Badillo with Mr. Roy.
 Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Young of Florida.
 Mr. Boland with Mr. McCloskey.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Wiggins.
 Mr. Gunter with Mr. Hammerschmidt.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9456) to extend the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 for 3 years.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9456, with Mr. REES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAs) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ESHLEMAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAs).

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9456, a bill to extend the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 for 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, the Select Subcommittee on Education, which I have the honor to chair, held hearings on legislation to extend the Drug Abuse Education Act during May and June of this year. On July 17, the subcommittee reported a bipartisan bill and on September 11, the measure was reported out of the full Education and Labor Committee with overwhelming approval.

I would like, at the outset, Mr. Chairman, to commend particularly the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) for his outstanding leadership in connection with this legislation. Mr. MEEDS is the original sponsor of the bill and has been a vigorous champion of more effective education on the abuse of dangerous drugs. I would also like to commend the gentleman from Kentucky, chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor (Mr. PERKINS), as well as the gentleman from Minnesota, the ranking minority leader (Mr. QUINN), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ESHLEMAN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER), the gentlelady from

Connecticut (Mrs. GRASSO), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LEHMAN), and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MAZZOLI).

FLEXIBLE AUTHORITY

Mr. Chairman, I would like to recall for the benefit of my colleagues the fact that the original act was a result of a bipartisan effort and received overwhelming support in both the House and the other body.

And although the measure was opposed then, as it is today, by the administration, the bill was passed in the House by a vote of 294 to 0 and in the Senate by a vote of 79 to 0.

Mr. Chairman, as I have previously noted, this is basically a 3-year extension of the original Drug Abuse Education Act.

Briefly, Mr. Chairman, the Drug Abuse Education Act provides for flexible and broad authority for support of drug abuse education activities, particularly in elementary and secondary schools and in local communities.

Specifically, the Drug Abuse Education Act provides for:

First, the encouragement, and support, of the development, demonstration, and effectiveness of innovative and improved curricula on the dangers of the abuse of drugs;

Second, dissemination of significant materials for use in a variety of institutions, of which schools and community organizations at the local levels are the most important;

Third, training of teachers, counselors, law enforcement officers, and other public service and community leaders;

Fourth, support of adult and community education programs, especially for parents; and

Fifth, providing resources to State and local educational agencies in planning, development and implementation of drug abuse education programs in the elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. Chairman, the authorizations for the Drug Abuse Education Act are: \$26 million for fiscal year 1974, \$30 million for fiscal year 1975, and \$34 million for fiscal year 1976, which is a total of \$90 million over the next 3 years. I note for my colleagues that this figure is a 50 percent reduction in authorization from that of the originally introduced bill, so I would say that an effort has been made to provide for realistic authorizations in the measure.

I also call special attention to the fact that the committee has legislated the priority of funding of programs which can be supported under the Drug Abuse Education Act and that the committee has also provided for increased assistance to State departments of education. This order of priority is primarily a result of the fact that the committee felt that the Office of Education had not followed the priority as stated in the original legislation and had ignored the congressional intent of providing programs of drug abuse education in elementary and secondary schools and of evaluating those programs.

Therefore, the bill under consideration provides that of the money appropriated, the first \$6 million will be assigned to the Secretary of Health, Education, and

Welfare for section 3 (a) and (b) purposes—curriculum development, training, demonstration, dissemination, evaluation, and community education.

The next \$5.6 million will be allotted to State education agencies for section 3(c) purposes, that is for aid to State departments of education for paying necessary expenses in assisting local education agencies in the planning, development, and implementation of drug abuse education programs.

The next \$6 million will be allocated to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for section 4 projects—community-oriented education programs for parents and community leaders. Such programs may include, among others, seminars, workshops, conferences, telephone counseling and information services to provide advice, information, or assistance to individuals with respect to drug abuse or drug dependency problems, the operation of centers designed to serve as a locale which is available to individuals seeking to discuss or obtain information, advice, or assistance with respect to drug abuse or drug dependency problems, arrangements involving the availability of so-called peer-group leadership programs, and programs establishing and making available procedures and means of coordinating and exchanging ideas, information, and other data involving drug abuse and drug dependency problems.

The next \$2.4 million of funds will be provided to State education agencies for section 3(c) purposes, that is for aid to State departments of education for paying necessary expenses in assisting local education agencies in the planning, development, and implementation of drug abuse education programs.

If any funds remain they will be assigned to section 4, community projects.

I would here note with respect to the second priority, that the \$5.6 million represents the provision in the bill which provides that each State shall receive a minimum of \$100,000 or 5 percent of section 3 money, whichever is greater. If there is not enough money to provide \$100,000 per State, then each State will receive equal amounts of available funds.

SUPPORT FOR LEGISLATION

The committee received extensive testimony from concerned citizens, youth services representatives, drug abuse prevention personnel, teachers and school administrators, State and local officials, as well as the administration on the question of continuing the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970.

With the exception of the administration officials, the witnesses unanimously urged the committee to extend the act.

The committee noted, however, that President Nixon has issued many calls for effective educational programs about the dangers of drug abuse. In particular, the committee was pleased at the President's statement of September 10, 1973, to the participants in the White House Conference on Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime to the effect that "we should continue a four-way approach to the problem of drug abuse—by cutting off sources of supply, strengthening law enforcement, providing better treatment pro-

grams, and continuing our programs of education."

Notwithstanding the President's statement, the administration, when testifying before the Select Subcommittee on Education, suggested that drug abuse education could be provided through other legislation. The committee was not persuaded by the testimony of the administration, and the position of the committee in this respect is outlined in more detail in the committee report.

The administration's argument, Mr. Chairman, namely, that there exists other legislation which can support drug abuse education is similar to that presented when the administration opposed enactment of the original act 3 years ago. The fact remains, however, that without this measure, acting as a stimulus, State and local educational agencies will not be able to provide the educational programs about drugs which are so greatly needed.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to address a few words to the minority view of two members of the committee in the report. They charge that drug abuse education can cause more damage than good, and allege that drug abuse education programs are not only ineffective, but counterproductive as they often have the effect of actually increasing drug abuse.

When the studies cited in the minority views are more closely examined, it is apparent that the studies, far from supporting the termination of the Drug Abuse Education Act, underline the need for extending the act.

For, without exception, each of these studies condemns precisely the kinds of informational, as opposed to educational, programs, which the Office of Drug Abuse Education, and the Committee on Education and Labor, have found to be so ineffective in the past.

CONCLUSION

It should be pointed out that the very studies which the minority views cite as "evidence" of the failure of the pilot programs funded by the Office of Drug Abuse Education argue strongly for the continued support of that office and its efforts.

For unless we develop and validate the kinds of adequate educational programs, which all of these studies support, and develop competently trained teachers to implement these programs, it is likely that the kinds of informational programs cited and "damned" by these studies will continue to proliferate.

As the able chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Crime (Mr. PEPPER) reported to the House of Representatives, following that committee's investigation, the use and abuse of drugs in our schools, indeed, is a profoundly serious problem and is clearly a cause for continued national concern. There was, therefore, in the committee's opinion, a continued national need to develop effective educational programs about the use and abuse of dangerous drugs.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore urge my colleagues to join in strong support of the passage of H.R. 9456.

Mr. PERKINS, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMANS, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS, Mr. Chairman, our colleagues from Indiana and Washington—JOHN BRADEMANS, chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education, and LLOYD MEEDS, a member of the subcommittee—deserve recognition for their efforts and leadership in engineering the original Drug Abuse Education Act to its enactment in 1970.

It is because of their continuing work and attention to the serious national problem of drug abuse that we have before us today not only a bill to extend the Drug Abuse Education Act but also to assure funding on a priority basis.

Aimed at increasing the number of adequately trained teachers and the supply of adequate scientific materials for teaching about the risks of drug use and abuse, the act made significant progress in the fight against this problem.

The hearing record compiled by our subcommittee attests to the success of the program, as well as indicating widespread and strong public support for the continuation of the act.

Many of the problems we recognized in 1970 are still with us. It is estimated that in 1972 there were approximately 500,000 to 600,000 heroin addicts in the United States.

Also, there are many more hundreds of thousands of Americans who use non-narcotic drugs to excess. The second report of the National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse stated that the degree of use of heroin and other opiates has increased from 2 percent in 1969 to 6 percent in 1972 among secondary school and college students.

Unfortunately, the extent of the problem is not limited to our schools, but rather is quite prevalent among nonstudents, and pervades the boundaries of class and income level throughout all areas of society. For example, the Commission also noted that alcohol witnessed an increase in sales from 1966 to 1971 of almost \$7 billion.

Mr. Chairman, as the above figures only scratch the surface of this pervasive problem, I feel that the necessity for passing H.R. 9456 is quite obvious. Further support for this legislation can be seen in the extensive testimony the committee received from concerned citizens, youth services representatives, drug abuse prevention personnel, teachers and school administrators, and State and local officials.

The bill before us today would extend the Drug Abuse Act and authorize appropriations of \$90,000,000 over a 3-year period. H.R. 9456 authorizes \$26,000,000 to be appropriated for fiscal year 1974—less than was authorized in the previous fiscal year. In fiscal year 1975 an additional \$4,000,000 is authorized, as is the case in fiscal year 1976. Furthermore, these funds are to be earmarked, so that the first \$6,000,000 is reserved for section 3 drug abuse education programs. The next \$5,600,000 would be available to State education agencies to enable them to assist local education agencies in the planning, development, and implementation of drug abuse programs.

The following \$6,000,000 would be available for section 4 community education projects. The next \$2,400,000 would

be provided to the State education agencies on the basis of population. The balance would be used to fund community projects.

Mr. Chairman, in view of these facts—and because the need is so great—I strongly urge my colleagues to support this excellent and extremely important piece of legislation.

Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. LANDGREBE).

Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. Chairman, I would like first of all to call your attention to the extensive comments in the minority views in the committee report offered by myself and Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. Chairman, I join with the administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in opposing this bill. I do not think that anyone can seriously question the President's dedication to eradicating drug abuse in this country. The fact that HEW has requested no new funding for this program and opposes this bill does not indicate that the administration has abandoned its strong commitment to drug abuse prevention. Rather it is indicative of the administration's effort to consolidate the wide variety of Federal drug abuse prevention programs, including drug abuse education.

Mr. Chairman, the administration is attempting to consolidate the many programs scattered throughout the Federal bureaucracy and to eliminate overlapping and duplicative authorities in this area that have, in the past, led to much confusion and wasted effort.

To this end, the President's budget would increase the funding for drug abuse prevention programs under the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention to \$40 million, an increase of \$15 million over fiscal 1973. Let me remind my colleagues that in the last Congress, we mandated the Special Action Office as the main arm of this country's drug abuse prevention effort, and it remains today our best hope for achieving victory in our coordinated battle on drug abuse problems in our Nation's cities and schools.

A battle that we must win—the sooner, the better. All sensible people would agree that programs aimed at reducing drug abuse are worthy of pursuit. But the people should be assured that their tax dollars for these programs are bringing the hoped-for results. However, evidence shows that the drug abuse education programs funded under this act to date have not only been a failure, but have aggravated the drug abuse problems in some of our schools. Recent reports of the Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse, the Task Force of the National Education Association, the Engineers Strategic Study Group of the Army, to mention only a few, have damned drug abuse education as not only ineffective, but counterproductive as they often have the effect of actually increasing drug abuse.

A recent study by the University of California School of Medicine at Los Angeles contends that the drug abuse education programs may be doing more to encourage than to prevent the use of

illegal drugs by students. The report of a Los Angeles high school survey noted that—

Following a drug education program more than one-third of the students thought that the programs encouraged the use of illegal drugs.

Mr. Chairman, how can we justify authorizing \$90 million over the next 3 years to be spent on this narrow categorical program of dubious value while rejecting out of hand the President's reasonable request for a coordinated drug abuse prevention program? This bill is not only fiscally irresponsible, it is also obstructionist in that it further inhibits our efforts to achieve an effective attack on our drug problems.

Mr. Chairman, curtailing drug abuse must have the highest national priority. Counterproductive programs such as these are not the answer. I urge the House to defeat this bill and begin to work with the administration for an effective Federal attack on this country's drug abuse problem.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER).

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of this legislation, and particularly I want to caution the Members of the House who have had a feeling that, due to changes in laws in many parts of the country, we are beginning to get the upper hand on the drug situation, and therefore there may not be the need to continue this type of program. The drug problem in the country is still of such magnitude that any little step forward that we may have made is absolutely no reason to consider cutting back on a program such as that of drug education, because the real purpose involved here is reaching our young people before they get involved with drugs, and not having to face the problem on how to rehabilitate them after they have been into the drug scene.

So I hope that everyone will continue to support this legislation as they have in the past. And, recognizing that it is a major need in our country today to continue to work to develop a curriculum, the teachers and the programs to show our young people that drugs are not the answer, and that the know-how of knowing what to avoid in this situation in dealing with drugs is of the utmost importance for all of us. And that we in the Congress very much support all national efforts to fight this disease.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS).

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 9456, an extension of the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970.

I wish at the outset to express my sincere appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) without whose help, it is very obvious to me, this bill would not have been able to have been placed before the House expeditiously. He has been an early and ardent supporter, and I very much appreciate his help.

The history of the Drug Abuse Education Act, Mr. Chairman, is locked in the

contemporary history of the United States. Late in the 1960's and early in the 1970's the drug abuse problem flashed upon contemporary American life like a meteor. It was new and frightening to the adults of this country, and it was new and sometimes enticing to the young people. It provided a new way to challenge the traditional values of the adult culture. The incidence of drug taking in those years increased not by mere 1 and 2 or 5 or 10 percentage points but by hundreds of percentage points in this Nation.

The tendency of the schools, Mr. Chairman, was first to ignore the problem and hope that it would go away. I recall very vividly the number of principals and superintendents who maintained vigorously in later 1969 and 1970 that they had no drug-abuse problem in their school districts, but if one simply went out on the campus and talked with the students, he would get figures that anywhere from 50 to 90 percent of the student body were at least involved in some kind of experimentation with drugs. The schools reacted when public clamor and criticism arose. They reacted by attempting to devise curricula to teach drug abuse education, and they found their teachers were inadequately trained, and who, because of this inadequate training, realized that they should not be teaching drug abuse education and did not desire to do so. So inadequately trained teachers were using inadequate curriculum.

At about this time the Drug Abuse Education Act was passed by the House and Senate, as the gentleman from Indiana has pointed out, unanimously in both bodies. The purposes of the act were to, by grant and contract, develop curriculums to demonstrate and test the effectiveness of each curriculum before it was utilized, to disseminate that curriculum so that the school districts across this Nation would have the advantage of teacher training, and finally to provide community education. It was a developmental bill, Mr. Chairman, and still is a developmental bill.

We provided only \$5 million in the first year, and we had to fight with the administration to get that money appropriated. The record of the Federal Government prior to that time was that we had spent in the year prior to that year, as I recall, only \$600,000 in the whole field of drug abuse education.

The administration of this act, I think I must confess, Mr. Chairman, has been, to put it mildly, less than inspiring. Rather than contract for the development of curriculums as the act calls for, the drug abuse education group in the Office of Education set up a clearinghouse to assemble those curriculums, and that was developed in other places and has been disseminated through that clearinghouse without validating and without contracting for testing and pilot programs, again as the act calls for.

They have done some teacher training. Indeed that is probably one of the better aspects of the administration of this bill by the Office of Education. They have effectively utilized their funds in teacher training. They have provided perhaps

the lion's proportion of the funds under the minigrant program, which as Members will notice in the report we have some questions as to the efficiency of.

But one of the very substantial success stories of the administration has been the community education programs through section 4. These are the peer groups, the crisis centers, and the hotlines which have been operated in many instances by young people themselves. Here has been really the cutting edge of education which has been effective because the credibility of these people has been established and is not subject to the questioning that occurs with some of the others, with adults and with teachers generally.

But, Mr. Chairman, despite the success, despite these few gains, the basic problem still exists. Drug taking is still ruining the lives of thousands of our young people. Many of the curriculums which are presently in effect are doing more harm than good. These are informational curriculums and not educational curriculums. The minority report says that certain groups—

... have damned drug abuse education as not only ineffective, but counterproductive, as they often have the effect of actually increasing drug abuse.

Some studies are cited as having been made by the Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse, the Task Force of the National Education Association, and the Engineers Strategic Study Group of the Army.

It is as unfortunate as it is obvious that the people who wrote the minority opinion did not read the full studies which they talk about, because if they had read the full studies they would have realized that it is apparent the studies, far from supporting termination of the drug abuse education activities, underline the need for extending the act, for without exception each of these studies contains precisely the kind of information, as opposed to educational programs, which the Office of Drug Abuse Education and the Committee on Education and Labor have found to be effective in the past. In other words, the programs that they are condemning in this report are informational programs, the early programs that were not developed properly, and they have not been tested and they indeed are perhaps more harmful than good.

So, Mr. Chairman, there still exists a great need for the development of curriculums and the evaluation of those curriculums. This should have been done a number of years ago and we still need to do so to provide the best possible types of programs.

We need to develop under the aegis of this bill better methods of teaching and we need to get more teachers involved. Teachers are reluctant to teach about drug abuse education because they feel poorly equipped and on balance they are poorly equipped to do that.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, there is a great need to do precisely the kinds of things authorized by this legislation. I entreat my colleagues to believe as I do that there is no magic wand which can be waved at the drug abuse problem in this

country which will cause it to disappear. Education is no exception to that rule but education has more potential in substantially curtailing the problem than any other single factor involved in the equation.

This is not just my idea but as our hearings established in city after city, in hearing after hearing, the statements of hard-bitten police chiefs and law enforcement officials and prosecuting attorneys and other prosecuting officials to a person; I know of not one of them who testified before our committee who did not testify emphatically that education of all things stands the greatest chance of altering the complex problem of drug abuse in our Nation.

So, I urge my colleagues to join with us by voting to continue and expand this valuable program.

Mr. Chairman, let me further discuss the validity of the charge that education is doing more harm than good:

The minority views charge that drug abuse education can cause more damage than good, and note that the National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse, the Task Force of the National Education Association, the Engineers Strategic Study Group of the Army, to mention only a few, have damned drug abuse education programs as not only ineffective, but counterproductive as they often have the effect of actually increasing drug abuse.

The views go on to cite a study by the University of California School of Medicine at Los Angeles which concluded that drug abuse education programs may be doing more to encourage than to prevent the use of illegal drugs, and notes that five Los Angeles junior high school students went out and bought drugs after a visit to their school of a drug abuse van because "the drugs in the van looked so good we wanted to try them."

When the studies cited in the minority views are more closely examined, it is apparent that the studies, far from supporting the termination of the Drug Abuse Education Act, underline the need for extending the Act.

For, without exception, each of these studies condemns precisely the kinds of informational, as opposed to educational, programs, which the Office of Drug Abuse Education, and the Committee on Education and Labor, have found to be so ineffective in the past.

NATIONAL COMMISSION OF MARIHUANA AND DRUG ABUSE

The National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse (Schaffer Commission) for example, reported, after surveying a number of studies of drug information and education programs, that comprehensive evaluations were lacking, but that:

Even without comprehensive evaluations, at least two clear conclusions emerge from isolated studies of different researchers: (1) most information materials now in the field are scientifically inaccurate and (2) most education programs operate in total disregard of basic communications theory. . . .

Any concerted effort designed to frighten people away from drugs is doomed to failure. No information at all is preferable to inaccurate, dogmatic information which destroys the credibility of the source. Accurate information, when disseminated through so-

called "sophisticated fear" techniques, can also be counterproductive.

The faith that "through accurate knowledge of drugs, their attractions and liabilities, drug abuse shall be avoided" was the pervasive theme of all the drug curricula reviewed in a Commission-sponsored study.

And the Commission continued:

At its best, drug education can be much more than this. First, it is a systematic presentation of information to a particular group of recipients; it is designed specifically for those recipients and attuned to their own level of sophistication, their knowledge and their views. Second, proper drug education employs a teacher trained not only to use the materials at hand, but also to relate to the recipients at a personal level and to use that relationship itself as an educational device.

Concluded the Commission:

Education should integrate information about drugs and drug use, including alcohol and the over-use of legal drugs, into broader mental hygiene or problem solving courses. In this way, the overall objective of encouraging responsible decision making can be emphasized, without placing the teacher in the position of defending drug policy or persuading the students to comply with it.

So, while it is true that the Commission has called for a "moratorium on all drug education programs in the schools," that recommendation is a result of an analysis of information programs, and is qualified by the statement that the moratorium should be enacted "at least until programs already in operation have been evaluated and a coherent approach with realistic objectives has been developed."

TASK FORCE OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

The Task Force of the National Education Association did not "damn" drug abuse education programs as ineffective.

What it did condemn was the use of scare informational techniques in the area of drug abuse.

Said the Task Force—

. . . false materials have been produced for and used in drug education with widespread indiscretion in schools across the nation . . . the Task Force feels that use of false, poor, emotionally oriented, and judgmental materials is more harmful than no materials.

And that is why Robert Winchester, a member of the NEA Task Force, told the Select Subcommittee on Education during oversight hearings in July 1972 that the National Education Association supported the Drug Abuse Education Act, and supported as well, additional funding for the measure.

And he told the subcommittee that the task force had made several recommendations which the NEA Board of Directors had accepted.

Said Mr. Winchester:

This task force has made several recommendations. One of its purposes was to develop a new resolution for the NEA. This resolution calls for the improvement of drug education programs at all levels, for uniform classification of drugs and for standardization of State drug laws. It also encourages NEA members to involve themselves in drug education programs at the State, local, and Federal levels.

So the NEA's support of increased appropriations for the Drug Abuse Education Act, as well as its call for improve-

ment in drug abuse education programs and the involvement of teachers in drug abuse education at every level, hardly supports the contention that NEA has "damned" drug abuse education as ineffective.

ENGINEERS STRATEGIC STUDY GROUP OF THE ARMY

Likewise, the Engineers Strategic Studies Group of the Army has condemned informational approaches to drug abuse, and, indeed, appears optimistic about the possibilities of truly educational approaches if properly developed.

After examining drug "education" programs across the Nation, and interviewing experts, the group cited several "lessons learned":

1. Scare tactics have not proved effective and can often be counterproductive.
2. Scientific facts, no matter how convincing they seem to adults, often fail to persuade the young.
3. Sources of information must be credible. Teachers must know the facts and deal with the positive aspects of drugs as well as the negative.
4. Different groups of young people respond to different approaches depending on their attitudes and experiences. . . .
5. Large group presentations are not effective.
6. One-shot, crash programs are not effective with the young. . . .
7. Education programs must start at early ages and continue through life.

And, the group went on to note:

As drug abuse continues to increase, education will become even more ineffective . . . unless basic changes in concept are made. To become effective, education programs must emphasize: (1) irrational influences on drug use decisions; (2) lifetime development of attitudes.

Concluded the report:

Education in general is not concerned only with learning facts or developing learning skills. The development of attitudes and skills for living in modern society is also a function of modern education. The same should be true of drug abuse education. Programs must delve beyond facts and into the motivations underlining the needs to misuse drugs.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Finally, the minority views cite a University of California at Los Angeles School of Medicine study which "contended that the drug abuse education programs may be doing more to encourage than to prevent the use of illegal drugs by students."

The study cited is to be found in the August 1973 Journal of the American Academy of Pediatrics, and although the authors claim to evaluate drug education programs they are indeed evaluating drug information programs.

In three of the four programs discussed, panel discussions, lectures, films, and a van displaying drugs are the principal means of providing the information about drugs. In none of these three programs are the teachers qualified to present materials on drugs, and, indeed, in one of the programs, physical education instructors are the teachers.

The results of these three programs are either inconclusive, or point toward the encouragement of drug abuse.

In the fourth program studied, the for-

mat is that of a lecture, followed by a discussion period led by a trained teacher and a physician. This program led to a marked decrease in the numbers of students who said they planned to consume alcohol, smoke, or experiment with drugs.

With reference to the fourth program, the study concluded that:

The outcome of this program provides cautious encouragement. Judging from the questionnaire studies on these children, the response and change in attitude after the program was very positive. It may be significant that this program was given by a specially trained teacher.

MACRO SYSTEMS STUDY

Yet another study which might have been cited in opposition to the Drug Abuse Education Act, was a study conducted by Macro Systems, Inc., which concluded in 1971 that most drug abuse education programs were ineffective.

Yet this study, which was made public only under pressure from the columnist Jack Anderson, was, once again, evaluating the very informational programs which the committee has agreed are worthless. Indeed, the study was conducted during 1971, during the first year of the existence of the Office of Drug Abuse Education, and did not, therefore, represent a valid study of the programs funded by that office.

Even so, the Macro Systems, Inc., study made recommendations which are a remarkable reflection of the philosophy espoused by the Office of Drug Abuse Education.

For the study concluded:

HEW could abandon drug education as a single issue concept and develop programs more in keeping with current youth development areas involving broader decision making and problem solving capabilities.

CONCLUSIONS

It should be pointed out that the very studies cited in the minority views as "evidence" of the failure of the pilot programs funded by the Office of Drug Abuse Education argue strongly for the continued support of that Office and its efforts.

For unless we develop and validate the kinds of adequate educational programs, which all of these studies support, and develop competently trained teachers to implement these programs, it is likely that the kinds of informational programs cited and "damned" by these studies will continue to proliferate.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DE LA GARZA).

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, the 15th Congressional District of Texas, which I represent, has a special interest in the Drug Abuse Education Act because of its location on the international boundary between the United States and Mexico.

The illegal movements of drugs across this border is a matter of serious and continuing concern. This is, of course, an enforcement problem, but it cannot logically be separated in our thinking from the legislation now before the House. We of the border area have a full understanding of the need for the kind of drug abuse educational program provided by H.R. 9456.

This bill, which would extend and

amend the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1950, is designed to provide more adequate scientific materials for teaching the dangers of drug abuse and to provide better trained teachers to do the job.

If this bill is enacted into law, as I trust it will be, I will recommend that the special interest of my district in drug abuse education be translated into action to establish a border training center to instruct qualified personnel in the essentials of more effective drug control. It would simply be good sense to place such a center in a location where people already are familiar with the elements of the basic problem and where we have facilities adequate for such an endeavor.

Mr. Chairman, we know in south Texas that, while progress has been made in combating drug abuse, we still have a long way to go before we can claim to have brought the problem under control. The need is still here for a national program to educate the American people about the dangers of drug abuse. The bill we are considering will continue and expand the present educational effort.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I rise, my colleagues, in support of this legislation. I think that the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. ESHLEMAN as the ranking minority Member, and Mr. MEEDS, have been deeply involved in this as well as other Members on both sides of the aisle, and are to be commended for their careful work on a program which is basically not only good, but basically important.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is valuable legislation. I think we by all means should pass this bill today.

Mr. Chairman, there is one amendment, however, on which I would make brief comment. There is a great deal of confusion about whether alcohol is a "drug" in the sense that most people use that term. There is no confusion about the fact that alcohol abuse is one of the Nation's most urgent national health problems. It is for that reason, to place emphasis on a very important phase of drug abuse education, that when we come to the amendatory time, I intend, on behalf of certain of my colleagues and myself, to propose an amendment to add the words "and alcohol" wherever "drug" appears in this particular bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is an extremely important thing that the educational process of drug abuse go forward. It is a very important part of that educational process that alcohol be emphasized. I shall talk further about the amendment at the time I offer it.

Mr. Chairman, I comment at this time to indicate my strong support for this legislation and my hope that this one amendment will be adopted by this body at the time it is offered.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HICKS).

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding to me, and I rise in support of the bill H.R. 9456. I am not a member of

the Committee on Education and Labor, and normally I would not be down here in this well, but I do have the privilege of chairing the special studies subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, and we spent about 25 or 30 days this year taking testimony on drugs and upon this particular problem.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) whom I like to regard as a friend of mine, spoke earlier here, kind of in a joking manner, about whether we should be considering caffeine. Very definitely, we should be considering caffeine; we should be considering alcohol, nicotine, and considering a great many substances that this bill should bring under its purview if it is properly utilized.

The Special Action Office that we established on drug abuse a couple of years or more ago is oriented more toward treatment than it is toward prevention. Certainly this bill is not the end-all, as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) suggested, but it is a step toward prevention. It is the only hope we have of prevention, as far as we could see in the special studies hearings that we held or, at least, one of the major hopes.

It is a very expensive proposition to let someone get addicted to any kind of drug, whether it is alcohol or barbiturates or heroin, or whatever it may be, and then treating for that addiction. It is a very expensive proposition, but we can measure the fact that an individual is a drug addict and that we are treating him.

Now, we may not be able to measure whether or not we have done any good in a prevention program; but school-wise the Spark program in New York did make some measurement as far as absenteeism, better grades, whether the youngsters are getting along with the school.

So I would urge the passage of H.R. 9456 which continues this program because it is one of the few means we have that will in effect give us some possibility to prevent the abuse of drugs including alcohol.

I listened very carefully to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. LANDGREBE) when he spoke in favor of his views, and also the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK). As far as I can tell, they do not believe that there is any use of trying to prevent. They say, put it all in the Special Action Office.

Well, the Special Action Office is not set up to carry on with education programs. Perhaps it is not possible to prevent drug abuse but only to treat addicts. This bill is one means of making an effort at prevention and if we can achieve an effective means of prevention we are tremendously more cost effective than by treating addicts.

The Special Action Office eventually self-destructs if we continue the view we now have in the statute.

When it self-destructs, then what happens? Unless established agencies that are going to continue to be on-going, like the Office of Education and many of the other departments that can have an effect on conditions that cause people to make the decision to take to drugs in the first place, have some expertise in this

business of drug abuse, then we are going to have nothing. We will be as someone once suggested about the Vietnam war. We will just declare the war on drugs over, that we have won it and stop funding it.

We cannot treat substance abuse that way.

As far as the Dellenback amendment is concerned, I am going to support that amendment. I believe the gentleman is absolutely correct; one reason is that when we established the Special Action Office on Drug Abuse we left alcohol out of its purview. Alcohol is the most seriously abused drug we have in the country, and there is only one way, as far as I can see, to point that up, and that is to include the word alcohol in the act.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal effort to control drug abuse has been the subject of intensive investigation by the Special Studies Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee. I am chairman of that subcommittee, and I believe the 21 days of hearings we held along with several field visits helped make that subcommittee aware of the nature of this problem and a little of what the Government can do about it.

The bill now before the House would provide for the continuation of one part of the Federal effort. Our subcommittee discussed the importance of drug education with representatives of the Office of Education, the special action office, and the National Institute of Mental Health. The position of the Government Operations Committee, as expressed in a recently issued report on the Federal strategy, is that there must be more emphasis on preventing drug dependence and a heightened public awareness of the dimensions of this problem—a reliance on facts and not myths. The committee also believes that it is important that long-term social and governmental agencies plan to assume a greater role in the drug abuse field. I think these recommendations bear on the bill now before the House.

First, what are the issues? There appears to be widespread agreement that prevention efforts are needed and that many of the educational programs conducted in our schools have not been effective. There is disagreement on which agencies should work with the educational system and as to whether alcohol should be specifically mentioned in this bill. The bill, as you know, designates the Office of Education as the Government agency to work with the school systems as well as with community leaders and, as presently written, does not include specific reference to alcohol.

Despite the agreement that prevention programs are necessary and that the educational system provides a mechanism for pursuing these programs, this bill is opposed by the administration and its spokesmen on the Education and Labor Committee and others. Two main objectives seem to be raised. First, the poor track records of many educational programs to date. Second, the organizational objection to having this educational effort in a different agency than the Special Action Office or the National Institute of Drug Abuse.

Let me comment, based on the evidence in our hearings, about these two concerns. First, as pointed out in the Education Committee's report on the bill, the failure of many past educational efforts does not of itself justify a vote against this bill. The reason is this: Generally speaking, these programs were not funded by the Office of Education. There is little point in expressing a displeasure at well-meaning but ineffective approaches by retaliating against the Office of Education when the testimony indicates that that Office did not sponsor these questionable programs. Our hearings and those of the Education Subcommittee which examined this bill dispute the view that "the drug education programs funded under this act have been a failure." There have been ineffective programs, but it is my understanding that the scare films and other objectionable tactics have not been the responsibility of Office of Education programs.

A second objection to the bill is that it leads to confusion because it continues drug abuse responsibility in yet another Federal agency. In this regard, I think there are at least three important considerations.

First, as the Government Operations Committee's report points out, it is necessary for established agencies to assimilate more of the ongoing efforts to control drug abuse. For this reason, it is important that the Office of Education, with its many ties to the educational community, be the vehicle for educational efforts. It will become necessary over the long term for the educational institutions of this country to pick up this responsibility as one of their continuing concerns—not to treat it as a specialized temporary phenomena.

Second, the educational system in the country is the mechanism through which we must work. I think it is of crucial significance in this debate to realize that the largest of the successful prevention efforts in the country—the multimillion dollar Spark program—is operated not by New York's drug agency but by the New York Office of High Schools. I believe that the Office of Education is the logical link to this program. Let me point out that at the time of our hearings in May, Dr. Jaffe, the then-Director of the Special Action Office testified that he knew no more about the Spark program than what he had read in the newspapers. If the educational system is to accept the challenges of preventing drug abuse, we should fund our support through the U.S. agency with the strongest ties to this system.

Third, the Office of Education has the communication linkages and the experienced people to operate with educational systems. As the report points out, the predecessor agency to the present National Institute of Drug Abuse admittedly does not have this expertise—it would have to create it. For those who are worried about overlapping and duplication, to vote against this bill is to vote for the establishment of a capability in drug abuse agencies paralleling that already existing in the Office of Education.

Finally, I think all of us recognized that alcoholism is the single greatest

problem of drug abuse and that more should be done in the educational field to bring this out. The Education Committee's position as reflected in its report is consistent with this, but I would point out that the Congress has used the term "drug abuse" in the past to exclude alcohol. In what was probably the single most important piece of legislation in the field, the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972, Congress created the Special Action Office but excluded alcohol from that organization's purview. Because of this precedent, I agree with those who believe it important to specifically mention alcohol in this legislation. There seems to be agreement that the legislation should encompass alcohol. I think specific mention is the only way to assure this unless one goes to an all encompassing title such as "abuse of substances." Technically that would probably be better except that it wouldn't conjure up the emotional response we probably need.

Mr. Chairman, I offer these views as my own and not as those of the members of my subcommittee. Those independent souls speak more vigorously than I. Based on my interpretation of what we learned in our hearings, I urge support for the bill and for the amendment to specifically include alcohol.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California. (Mr. DANIELSON).

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 9456, to extend the Drug Abuse Education Act for 3 more years. I think this is the least we can do to try to do something to bring this most tragic problem under some kind of control. Every person, man or woman, who becomes addicted to the use and abuse of drugs has had to make a personal decision at one time or another whether to do so or whether not to.

The very least we can do is to provide those people with adequate information to make their choice.

I urge the support of every Member on this bill.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio. (Mr. ASHBROOK).

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, we are all well aware of the drug abuse problem which is currently plaguing our Nation. The frightening cost of this problem cannot be measured in terms of dollars alone. Far more important are the ruined human lives of those who fall victim to drugs.

I do not believe, however, that Congress will find an answer to this problem by haphazardly voting millions of dollars to extend all sorts of programs. We need an organized, comprehensive, and sensible approach to drug abuse prevention. Such an alternative exists in the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, established by Congress in Public Law 92-255. The Special Action Office can and should coordinate Federal efforts in drug abuse prevention programs.

We need a coordinated national effort. Our Nation's drug problem is too important a matter to be relegated to a piecemeal approach.

The following minority views on this legislation were joined in by Mr. LANDGREBE and myself:

MINORITY VIEWS

We join with the Administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in opposing this bill. We do not think that anyone can seriously question the President's dedication to eradicating drug abuse in this country. The fact that HEW has requested no new funding for this program and opposes this bill does not indicate that the Administration has abandoned its strong commitment to drug abuse prevention. Rather it is indicative of the Administration's effort to consolidate the wide variety of Federal drug abuse prevention programs, including drug abuse education.

The Administration is attempting to consolidate the many programs scattered throughout the Federal bureaucracy and to eliminate overlapping and duplicative authorities that have, in the past, led to much confusion and wasted effort. To this end the President's budget would increase the funding for drug abuse prevention programs under the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention to \$40 million, an increase of \$15 million over fiscal 1973. This Special Action Office, as mandated by the Congress in P.L. 92-255, is our best alternative for achieving an effective, coordinated attack on drug abuse problems in our nation's cities and schools.

Certainly most people would agree that educational programs aimed at reducing drug abuse are worthy of pursuit. But the people should be assured that their tax dollars for these programs are bringing about the hoped-for results. In this light, we want to remind our colleagues that recent reports of the Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse, the Task Force of the National Education Association, the Engineers Strategic Study Group of the Army, to mention only a few, have damned drug abuse education as not only ineffective, but counterproductive as they often have the effect of actually increasing drug abuse.

A recent study by the University of California School of Medicine at Los Angeles contended that the drug abuse education programs may be doing more to encourage than to prevent the use of illegal drugs by students. The report of a Los Angeles high school survey noted that "following a drug education program more than one-third of the students thought the programs encouraged the use of illegal drugs." Meanwhile, it is said: "Five Los Angeles junior high school pupils went out and bought drugs after having been shown them in a drug education van because 'the drugs in the van looked so good we wanted to try them.'"

In addition, several witnesses appearing before the Select Subcommittee have stated that it is a waste of the taxpayers' money.

How can we justify authorizing \$90 million over the next three years to be spent on this narrow categorical program of dubious value while rejecting out of hand the President's reasonable request for a coordinated drug abuse prevention program?

In our opinion, curtailing drug traffic should have the highest national priority. However, the drug abuse education programs funded under this Act have been a failure, and possibly have even aggravated the drug abuse problems in our schools. Therefore, we urge our colleagues to join us in opposing H.R. 9456 when it is brought to the Floor of the House.

EARL F. LANDGREBE,
JOHN M. ASHBROOK.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation and would like to indicate that I hope the Biaggi-Dellenback amendment to include alcoholism is adopted by the committee.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, alcoholism is clearly our No. 1 drug problem. Recent studies indicate that the disease is on the upswing among youth who find this legal way of getting high better than risking arrest and long-term imprisonment for taking illegal narcotics or dangerous drugs.

The National Council on Marihuana and Drug Abuse found that 56 percent of our junior high school students and 74 percent of our senior high school students have used alcoholic beverages—up substantially from a survey taken 3 years ago.

Yet the bill before us today, as it has been reported, places no emphasis on this serious problem. While opponents of the Dellenback-Biaggi amendment argue that alcohol abuse is covered by the legislation, a staff study disclosed that less than 10 percent of the programs funded under the act are concerned with the problem of alcoholism.

Adding the words "and alcohol" in the act wherever drug abuse appears will emphasize the concern of this body for this difficult and widening problem. We have all heard the horror stories of youths coming to school stoned on amphetamines or marihuana. Yet similar stories exist relating to the problem of alcohol abuse. In one high school in Long Island, regular Saturday night alcohol fests involving 100 or more students are held. The football field becomes so littered with beer cans, wine and whiskey bottles, it must be cleaned up Monday before it can be used.

My colleague from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) and I want to see more of the federally funded programs aimed at drug abuse broadened to include alcohol abuse as well. I am not saying we should abandon our effort to alert youths to the problems of other types of drug abuse; but rather we must have balanced, coordinated programs.

By ignoring the problem, by remaining silent, we are in fact condoning the use of alcohol by youths. We are giving them an alternative high to marihuana, barbiturates, and amphetamines. In fact, many parents seem relieved that their children are drinking rather than taking other drugs. Yet, the problem remains the same. The addiction is there. The debilitation of mind and body is no less severe. It is the social acceptance of alcohol as a legitimate high that poses the most serious threat. In our quest for escape from the evils of modern society, in the desires of our youth to experience new heights of pleasure, we may be breeding a nation of alcoholics.

Over 9 million Americans are now afflicted. Many more remain undetected. Yet when this body is called upon to take recognition of the need and respond with Federal support for programs aimed at alcoholism, we balk. To refuse this amendment would be a grave mistake. I urge its overwhelming passage.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, one of the most innovative and creative experiments developed under the Drug Education Act of 1970 is the Help Communities Help Themselves program initiated last year by the Office of Education's National Drug Education program.

This program is based on the hypothesis that the people who are closest to the drug situation in our local communities can deal with their own problems—given training and modest support. This program makes it possible for communities to develop the capability to respond to local problems using their firsthand knowledge of their problems and their local resources.

In the past year, teams of five to six individuals from 1,000 communities of all sizes have received 2 weeks of training and followup technical assistance from seven regional training centers supported by this program. These teams represent schools, youth, parents, professionals, law enforcement agencies, and other community groups. They are given training in the complex dynamics of drug use and abuse, need assessment and creative problem solving techniques. Utilization of their local human and material resources to create and implement an effective local response to drug abuse is stressed.

The Regional Training Center located in Minneapolis is associated with the University of Minnesota, College of Education. This center serves 10 States—Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, and Wisconsin. The Minneapolis Center is located in an apartment building and occupies several apartments situated on one floor. They are used as offices, classrooms, and living quarters for the teams undergoing training. The teams live together, work together, and during the 2 week training period, learn of each other's involvement in the drug abuse problem. An understanding of the other person's perspective on drug abuse is an important product of this learning process.

The committee report on H.R. 9456 emphasizes that the funds authorized by this legislation should be spent for educational drug abuse programs rather than for programs that only inform. Dr. John Ottina, U.S. Commissioner of Education has stated:

The Office of Education has not supported the purely informational programs that are now in question. Simply stated we do not equate education with information, nor learning with teaching.

The Help Communities Help Themselves program is aimed at educating local people, and helping them learn about and respond to the local drug abuse problem. In the Minneapolis region this program is functioning well. We should extend the Drug Abuse Extension Act of 1970 for 3 years as the committee proposes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, as we meet today to consider H.R. 9456, the Extension of the Drug Abuse Education Act for 3 more years, I would like to comment briefly on this bill and on the administration's antinarcotics effort as a whole.

The greatest success this Government can point to in the field of drug abuse is in the area of education for our young people about the dangers posed by the illegal use of narcotics and prescription drugs. Only by means of precise knowledge can our youngsters be able to resist

the many pressures to try out drugs and "be one of the guys." Fortunately, today's young Americans are aware of the value of independence and nonconformity when it comes to drug abuse, and much of their new knowledge is the result of programs which have been supported through the Drug Abuse Education Act over the last 3 years.

I firmly support extension of the Drug Abuse Education Act as reported by the Committee on Education and Labor. I am concerned that we not include alcoholism in our definition of "drug" until and unless there are separate funds available for education in the proper use of alcoholic beverages. I share my colleagues' concern about the serious abuse which takes place in the use of alcohol, but we cannot afford to subdivide our funding for the Drug Abuse Education Act at this time.

The very fact that such an amendment is to be offered is indicative of one of the very severe problems we, as Congressmen, must now face about drug abuse. As chairman of the Special Subcommittee on International Narcotics Control, I have been favorably impressed with the deep commitment of administration officials to the battle to wipe out drug misuse in this country. But I am nevertheless disappointed that some officials believe we have this problem under control to such a degree that we can tone down our efforts in educating teenagers about drug use.

Apathy about this serious problem cannot be allowed to take over, or we will witness a resurgence of the epidemic of use which shook this Nation in the late 1960's and early 1970's. This will not happen unless the Congress shirks its duty to provide for continuing opportunities to educate young America about the dangers inherent in drug abuse. A full, undivided extension of the Drug Abuse Education Act is the best way to do this.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, Arkansas is abused by drugs. In the first 6 months of 1973, the number of drug abuse arrests in Forrest City, Ark.—population 12,763—increased 1,037 percent.

In 1972 there was a 100-percent increase over 1971 in the number of felony cases filed in the First Judicial District of Arkansas in connection with the narcotics and drug abuse problem.

The prosecuting attorney of Lawrence County says that one-third of the children of Walnut Ridge, Ark.—population 4,000—are on drugs. And, the youth in the community say drug use is still growing—that even kids in grade school are using harder drugs like LSD.

No, drug abuse is not a problem limited to the crowded inner city. It has spread to the suburbs and is thriving in the heartlands of America. It is a problem that has been and is manifesting itself in every congressional district in this country.

Over the past 3 years as I traveled and visited with students in almost every high school in my territory in northeastern Arkansas, I became increasingly aware of and disturbed by the abuse of drugs by school age youth. And, more encouragingly, I found that the students themselves are concerned about this sit-

uation. They are aware of some of the dangers of abuse and many expressed an interest in doing something about it.

It was these travels and discussions that led me to sponsor a Congressional Conference on Drug Abuse for students, faculty and PTA members in the 21 counties of the First Congressional District of Arkansas. Doctors, lawyers, law enforcement officials, pharmacists, and psychiatrists all participated in "rap" sessions from which I, and hopefully the other participants, gained much valuable information on and a better insight into the problem as it exists in our communities in Arkansas.

It was apparent from the conference that we definitely have a drug abuse problem in Arkansas and that an effective drug education program might be one step toward the long-term solution of the problem in Arkansas and in our Nation.

Let me share with you some other conclusions I drew from this conference. First, the intensity of drug use in the First Congressional District, whose largest town has a population of 27,000, is about 15 to 18 months behind that of metropolitan areas. I base this conclusion on the types and amounts of drugs now found in the district and on studies by Dr. H. W. Smith, director of research for the Memphis Drug Abuse Commission and a consultant to the Crowley's Ridge Development Council in Arkansas.

Drug abuse is widespread in Arkansas and I doubt seriously that there is any community in the district where drugs or marihuana are not available.

Students are starting to experiment with drugs at an earlier age, even in elementary school and the use of drugs is gaining social acceptability among the middle class. Although the first users of drugs were generally associated with the counter culture, we must accept the fact that the use of drugs now spreads into all levels of society.

Finally, I concluded that law enforcement, while a deterrent to drug abuse, has not and is not eliminating the problem. We must establish and expand our drug abuse prevention education programs at all levels beginning in the elementary schools. Too much of our thrust in drug education has been toward high school and junior high school students and this often comes too late.

And perhaps more importantly, drug abuse education should be made available to parents. There is a wide communications gap between students and parents and students and educators on the subject. Some of the adult community remains incredibly oblivious to the daily use of drugs by members of the younger generation.

For example, take the case of a 17-year-old high school student in one small town in my district who was arrested for sales of controlled substances and allowed to plead guilty to the lesser charge of possession. This particular young man was given a 1-year sentence and made to serve 2 to 4 weeks in the county jail. Throughout his life he has been very active in his church. His parents still believe their son was only caught up in an innocent attempt to help a friend and

that he has never used drugs. Despite his arrest, testimony by an Arkansas State Police undercover agent, and his guilty pleas to charges of possession, they still refuse to believe their son's actions.

The parent of another young man convicted in this same case gave this statement to the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

I had absolutely no knowledge of my son's involvement before his arrest. At first it was terrible. It came right out of the clear blue sky—particularly in a small town. At first I was really upset, but after talking to people (the sheriff and prosecuting attorney), I realized we were not the only family.

The sad thing is, the kids are getting picked up and the people behind it are still free. Things are really bad in Imboden (population 500). A lot of kids are still messing around (with drugs) . . .

Never say you know everything your child is doing. You may know some things, but you never know it all.

In the case of the parents, awareness or rather complete lack of awareness seems to be the key problem.

In the case of their children, instituting an effective education program may be a little more complicated. These people know about drugs. Most of them have either experimented with them or have had close contact with someone else who has used drugs. Drugs, unfortunately are a part of their environment. Scare films or those which preach the immorality of drug use will not work. I believe many of our youth are merely amused at some of our so-called drug education programs and films nowadays. On the screen they see the high school dropout or the unpopular girl turn to drugs. In reality they see the senior class president, the captain of the cheerleaders and the valedictorian turning on with marihuana or popping an upper.

With few exceptions every law enforcement officer with whom I have discussed this problem has pointed to the need for drug education and most call for starting it early. Gene Raff, prosecuting attorney of the First Judicial District in Arkansas and a member of the Arkansas Drug Abuse Authority says he feels better results are achieved at the elementary level. As Raff states it:

At the high school level, some feel they know more than the experts, and we need to get there before Mister Wiseguy.

The late Marvin Gunn, former chief of police at Forrest City said he did not really know the answer to the problem which had resulted in the 1,000 percent increase in his city. He lamented:

You can punish them, but unless you can change them, they'll go right back.

Gunn did cite two big needs at the State level—a total concept facility for treating drug addicts—including medical and psychological treatment—and a State appropriation for literature and films on drug education for use by counties and cities on a lending library basis. One of Gunn's assistants pointed out that there were only five films available for loaning to the 75 counties in Arkansas.

The causes for drug abuse have been widely discussed and argued. Dr. John Buckman, an associate professor of psychiatry at the University of Virginia

Medical School, who delivered the keynote address at the congressional drug conference, suggested three primary reasons for increasing drug abuse in America: First, In search for the quickest answer to problems, we tend to resort to chemicals to give us emotional stability while relieving temporary pains; Second, We constantly face issues which have no apparent solution, such as pollution, crime, racial strife, and war; and Third, We are growing up and living in an increasingly highly sophisticated environment.

It is this last reason which Dr. Buckman credits for giving rise to our new crisis of young children turning to drugs. Because of widespread instant communications, advance technology, and social advancements in this country many 8 to 10-year-olds are so sophisticated that they are bored with everyday life. The only new thing for them is a drug buzz. Younger and younger children are using more and more bizarre drugs in experiments on themselves. All too often we hear of fatalities resulting from intravenous injections of such things as peanut butter, mayonnaise, wine, and hydrogen peroxide.

Could we need any more of a reason to institute these drug education programs at an early age?

In this connection, there is one other factor which I believe has contributed greatly to the pill for every problem attitude to which our children are exposed at such an early age. I believe there may be a relationship between this early exposure by means of advertisements of certain health aids in popular news media and the growing tendency among young people to view drug abuse as acceptable. I think intensive study needs to be given the effect of these ads on our young people and on the possible need for expanded regulation over the content of the ads.

It is now time for us to educate our people—young and old—and expose any myths which might still exist in the area of drug use.

Although I am certainly no expert on the subject, it appears that there can be no solution to the drug abuse problems this country faces today until attitudes are changed and we identify and treat the causes of drug abuse. Education seems to be our key to getting at that solution—education which extends beyond the confines of New York City and extends into communities such as Walnut Ridge.

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, the drug abuse education program which is before us today has been in existence for almost 3 years. The concept and objectives of this program are certainly beyond debate, but there appears to be some serious questions as to the results of this program.

Many of us find ourselves in a dilemma over extension of the Drug Abuse Education Act. We are dedicated to eliminating the national problem of drug abuse and we are equally committed to ensuring that tax dollars are spent in the most efficient manner possible.

Testimony before the Education and Labor Committee on this bill was mixed.

The administration has strongly opposed this bill urging that all education drug abuse programs be consolidated under the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention. Much of the favorable testimony praised the objectives of the program, although it dealt primarily with generalities and contained little mention of specific successes.

On the basis of this mixed testimony, we are now being asked to authorize \$90 million for this program for the next 3 years. I have serious reservations about supporting such a dramatic increase without tangible evidence that the program is achieving its desired objectives.

The Dellenback amendment expanding the phrase drug abuse to drug and alcohol abuse makes the bill more palatable.

Mr. MARAZITI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the drug education bill before us today. Our main fight against the illegal drug trade in this country should be in the area of drug education. Yet, it seems that despite our efforts to date, drug addiction continues to take a tremendous toll on American youth.

In view of this, I would like to add a few words of caution about the future direction of our drug education efforts.

The administration advises us that the National Institute of Mental Health has both the authority and a budget to carry out drug education programs.

Taxpayer dollars are precious. HEW officials should make sure there is no duplication of effort between NIMH and its own program. I would like to see a co-operative program carried out by both agencies so we are sure to get maximum advantage from dollars channeled into drug education.

Further, it is vitally important that the bulk of the money under this bill be spent at the local school level for actual drug education courses. We have spent too much money developing curriculum and training teachers and too little actually carrying out drug education programs.

Alabama in particular has been largely successful with its drug education effort. Perhaps educators should take a good look at their method for what could be the key to future success at the operation level. Alabama schools have routinely infused drug education into all classroom work where it naturally fits, such as in the sciences. Drug education is made part of the normal education process.

My own feeling is that the real answer to successful drug education efforts lies in mandatory hours of drug education in grades 1 through 12.

Children too often experiment with drugs rather than incur the displeasure of their friends and classmates.

Only through long-term education can we hope to develop new attitudes about drugs among schoolchildren.

Then, hopefully the peer group pressure prevalent in schools across the Nation will be one of spelling out the evils of drug addiction, rather than one advocating its use.

I sincerely hope the money available under this bill is mainly directed toward assisting local schools to implement drug education programs that will dry up drug trade in our schools. Our youth are

the Nation's most precious resource. We can, and must eradicate this cancer from our society.

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of H.R. 9456. Inasmuch as the most effective way of fighting our drug problem is by preventing drug addiction in the first place, a program such as this which seeks to alert pupils in the public school systems and citizens in the community at large to the real dangers of drug abuse carries the best hope of combating this serious national problem.

The proposed extension of the act is deficient, however, because it does not clearly include "alcohol" in the drug abuse education program. I support the amendment to add the words "alcohol" following the word drug so that there will be no mistake about the intention of Congress that it is as equally important to alert the community, particularly young students, to the pitfalls connected with alcohol, as it is to alert them to the dangers of more exotic drugs. Alcoholism, although socially acceptable in our society is the country's most serious drug problem. It has been estimated that 50 percent of the people in our prisons for murder, rape, burglary, and so forth, committed those crimes after the excessive consumption of alcohol. (Alcoholism and Narcotics, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, 91st Cong. pt. I, pp. 119-120.) This is to say nothing of the cost to industry and the added death tolls on the road directly traceable to alcohol abuse. Let us, by favoring the above mentioned amendment, be certain that our young people be informed of the dangers of alcohol.

The opponents of this amendment say that such an addition is superfluous, inasmuch as it is generally presumed that alcohol is a drug. However, in my opinion there is much more confusion about whether alcohol is a drug in the sense that most people use the term. The very fact that some of my colleagues feel that the act should be amended to include alcohol within the definition of the term "drug" is evidence enough of the uncertainty of the definition. I therefore recommend its adoption.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in past weeks this Nation has been subjected to one crisis after another on both the national and international levels. While these matters which affect all of us should rightly be the concern of all the citizens, we cannot turn our backs on other problems which are also growing in our own hometowns throughout the Nation.

Drug abuse is perhaps one of the greatest of these domestic issues. The illegal and excessive use of drugs, including alcohol, has grown in the past decade to almost epidemic proportions. Law enforcement officials are constantly working to end this trend, but punishment after the fact will not alleviate the problem. We must act to stop our citizens, both young and old, from beginning a career of drug abuse which could have a dangerous, perhaps even deadly, result. Preventive education is the main purpose of H.R. 9456, which would extend the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 for an additional 3 years. This legislation

provides for \$90 million authorization for Federal, State, and community sponsored drug abuse education projects.

Drug abuse and its related problems do not recognize the barriers of race, religion, or social position. The child next door, as well as the child living across the tracks can be a present or potential drug abuser. This makes it impossible to single out a particular group or one area for education—the campaign must be nationwide.

The Drug Abuse Education Act passed the House by an overwhelming margin in 1970. I believe we all realize that despite the program's success, much remains to be done. Preventive action must be taken now to keep the problem from again reaching the crisis level of the late 1960's. I would therefore like to give my support to the extension of the Drug Abuse Education Act and I would urge every other Member to do likewise.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly urge and hope that this bill before us, H.R. 9456, to extend the Drug Abuse Education Act for 3 years, will be promptly and overwhelmingly approved by this House this afternoon.

The authoritative evidence revealed here today permits, unfortunately, no doubt at all that the problem of drug use and abuse in this country is still of major proportion and vital concern to the American people.

The need, therefore, for this bill is emphatic and this measure represents a prudent and reasonable step to adequately strengthen the basic elements that recognized authorities agree are critical to the success of a continuing drug abuse education program.

These elements are, briefly, a responsive recognition that the most serious danger of drug abuse exists among our youth and therefore, local elementary and secondary schools and community organizations are the best means through which to educate our young people against the danger; that it is essential, for the education of both youth and adults, to develop valid, credible and more attractively interesting material to more persuasively indicate the great evils of drug abuse; that there is an urgent need to provide better training to more teachers; and, finally, that it is imperative to continuously evaluate the effectiveness of both the curriculum and training so that the Congress, the executive department of the National Government and all other concerned institutions may act more intelligently and effectively in trying to progressively overcome this modern plague of drug abuse especially among our young people.

In substance, Mr. Chairman, these are the fundamental factors, among others, that this legislation is designed to strengthen and improve in order to effectively contain and eventually eliminate the spreading drug abuse curse that presently afflicts and threatens the health, safety, and security of our people and our country.

I hope, therefore, that this measure is speedily and resoundingly adopted in the national interest.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I

rise in support of the Drug Abuse Education Act extension (H.R. 9456).

The use of drugs in this country has become a disease of epidemic proportions. Educating our citizens about drugs is like an inoculation; it creates an immunity that defends the recipient from a dangerous disease.

The extension of the Drug Abuse Education Act is an important and necessary action for Congress to take. H.R. 9456 would authorize \$90 million for a 3-year period to be spent on elementary and secondary school and community drug abuse education programs. Six million dollars would be allocated for direct HEW assistance to such programs; \$5.6 million for State education agencies' efforts to assist local agencies in program planning and implementation; \$6 million for direct HEW support for community education projects; \$2.4 million for State education agencies, and the remainder for direct grants to community education projects.

The Education and Labor Committee has aptly pointed out that the continuing increase in addiction requires a maximum Federal effort in law enforcement, treatment and rehabilitation, and education, where Federal assistance can help deal with the problem at the initial stage. I agree and, therefore, urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for an extension of the Drug Abuse Education Act, because it is now more important than ever that young people be informed about the social, psychological, and medical dangers of drug abuse—as best we can define those dangers. It is true that heroin addiction is declining throughout the country, but it is by no means true that the "drug crisis" is abating. Partially because of the continuous social and political unrest of the last few years, partially because of changing social mores among the young, and partially because of an abdication of adult responsibility in setting strong social example and convincing moral guidelines, we have a young generation—and even those who are not so young—highly prone to every sort of abuse.

Prescription and nonprescription drugs are heavily abused by teenagers and young adults in every part of the country, and many of these drugs come into heavy use before word-of-mouth medical fact has reached the users. This was particularly true of methaqualone, which was undergoing extremely heavy use long before education programs were prepared to explain the addicting qualities of the drug, and its medical and psychological side-effects.

I must reject out of hand the notion that properly conducted drug education programs cannot accomplish the end of deterring abuse. If studies are showing that education programs are contributing to drug abuse, it is obvious that it is not the program or the funding support to explain the addicting quantities of the of these programs, which are at fault, but it is the teaching methods and the teachers themselves who must undergo scrutiny.

Like any other subject, drug abuse must be approached with a certain competence. We do not ask philosophers to teach chemical engineering, and we should not be asking untrained or poorly trained elementary and secondary school teachers to teach drug education programs.

Those who do teach these programs, and those who prepare the supporting materials for them, must have specific medical knowledge of the drugs they explain, as well as sufficient knowledge of the human dimensions of drug abuse. Young people do not take these drugs in strictly clinical environment, nor are they likely to respond to a dry, clinical lecture. In other words, the teachers should know the broad range of their subject as thoroughly as any expert in any other field. This means more than book knowledge of drug abuse; it means an understanding of the particular local conditions which impinge on potential abusers.

It seems to me that, if preliminary studies are indicating that drug abuse education is failing in some areas, we had better look directly at the teacher, the method of instruction, and those who recommend the content of the instruction. There are countless areas in this country where millions of dollars are being spent to teach children to read—and those children are not learning. When confronted with such findings, we do not think to recommend that reading programs be terminated. Nor does such a conclusion follow from studies which have been cited during this debate.

Those who suggest that drug abuse education is somehow cultivating drug abuse are looking at study results with less than objectivity, and with less than an understanding of what education in any social or scientific discipline can and should accomplish.

I strongly urge support of this legislation, Mr. Chairman, as I do strongly urge that evaluations of the on-going drug education programs concentrate on the "Why" of shortcomings, rather than on the shortcomings themselves.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, under leave to revise and extend my remarks on the bill H.R. 9456, I would like to share with my colleagues an editorial on the Federal drug abuse education programs that appeared in the Wall Street Journal of October 16, 1973. As the article points out, it is extremely unfortunate that the "do something" school of thought in this Congress is so prevalent that it is virtually impossible to give experimental legislation such as H.R. 9456 the close scrutiny that it deserves if its sponsors have the foresight to give it a charismatic title.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the President to veto this bill, if it passes the Senate and comes to his desk. Then, once again, it will be up to the President to exercise the kind of sound consideration and fiscal responsibility that has been so sorely lacking in the Congress this session. I only wish that the adherents of the "do something" school in this body would join with the administration in doing something about coordinating an

effective attack on our national drug abuse problem.

The text of the Wall Street Journal editorial follows:

THE "DO SOMETHING" SCHOOL

Americans characteristically believe that ingenuity, money and good-will can solve almost any problem. So it was probably inevitable that when drug abuse became epidemic a few years ago, the federal government funded a multi-million dollar drug abuse education act.

That act expires this year, and plans are underway in Congress to extend it another three years and also substantially increase the initial \$58 million authorization. However, some Congressmen want to eliminate the act altogether. Rep. Earl Landgrebe (R-Ind.) for one, points out that several evaluations of the program have been sharply critical. He favors "deglamorizing" drug education by leaving the entire program, including funding, to local communities.

Whatever the merits of the drug abuse education act, it would appear that drug education generally is not the panacea a good many people had hoped it would be. Three scientists who surveyed programs among high school, junior high and grade school students reported that such programs not only may fail to decrease drug usage among high school students, but may in some cases cause them to experiment with illegal drugs. And in its final report last March, the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse recommended that states consider a freeze on drug instruction in schools. Such instruction, it said, may stimulate young people's interest in drugs.

Some of this is probably conjecture. At any rate, it borders on hearsay to suggest that money, good intentions and the urge to do something right now are not always enough to solve pressing social problems. The history of the past decade strongly suggests that many Americans would rather do something, even if it is the wrong thing, than give the appearance of doing nothing at all.

But lofty ambitions make for bad social legislation when they fail to take political reality into account. And political reality means questioning the assumption of even the most popular legislative proposals. It means asking what the side effects are likely to be.

And if the assumptions prove to be faulty or the side effects unexpectedly harmful there would be no hesitancy to scrap a piece of legislation as a bad job. If that happened more often there would be far less opposition to the "do something" school of thought.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(c) of the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 is amended by inserting " , whichever is greater," after "not to exceed", and by inserting after "this section" the following: " , or the amount provided in subsection (e)."

Sec. 2. Section 3(e) of the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 is amended to read as follows:

"(e) (1) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$14,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, \$16,000,000 for the fis-

cal year ending June 30, 1975, and \$18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, for purposes of carrying out this section.

"(2) Of the funds appropriated to carry out this section for a fiscal year, \$6,000,000 may be used by the Secretary only for grants and contracts under subsection (a).

"(3) From the funds appropriated to carry out this section for a fiscal year, \$100,000 shall be made available by the Secretary to each State agency for paying its expenses under subsection (c), except that if the funds so appropriated are inadequate for such purpose, the amount made available to each such agency shall be reduced pro rata.

"(4) Where the funds appropriated under section 4 exceed \$6,000,000 for a fiscal year and where such funds are available for expenditure under the proviso of section 4, the Secretary, out of funds appropriated to carry out this section, may, in addition to payments authorized by paragraph (2), make payments for expenses for State educational agencies under subsection (c) in an amount not aggregating more than \$2,400,000, but the amount paid any State shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount available under this paragraph for payments to all the States as the population of the State bears to the population of all the States.

"(5) From the funds appropriated to carry out this section for a fiscal year, not more than \$500,000 shall be used by the Secretary for an independent analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of drug abuse and drug dependency education programs.

"(6) Funds appropriated to carry out this section which remain after the application of the preceding paragraphs may be used to carry out this section without restriction."

SEC. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "There is authorized to be appropriated \$12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, \$14,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and \$16,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, for grants and contracts to carry out this section: *Provided*, That no funds appropriated for any fiscal year to carry out this section may be expended until the amount appropriated for that year to carry out section 3 exceeds \$11,500,000."

Mr. BRADEMAs (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLENBACK

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELLENBACK: Page 3, line 13, after "Sec. 2." insert "(a)".

Page 4, line 19, insert "and alcohol" after "drug" each time it appears.

Page 4, after line 23, insert:

"(b) The Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 1001-1007) is further amended (1) by striking out 'drug abuse' each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'drug and alcohol abuse', (2) by striking out 'abuse of drugs' each time it appears in section 3(b) and inserting in lieu thereof 'abuse of drugs and alcohol', (3) by striking out 'drug abusers or drug dependent persons' in section 3(b)(8) and inserting in lieu thereof 'drug or alcohol abusers or drug or alcohol dependent persons', (4) by striking out 'drug dependency' each time it appears in

section 4 and inserting in lieu thereof 'drug and alcohol dependency', and (5) by inserting after 'Drug' in section 1 the following: 'and Alcohol'."

Mr. DELLENBACK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am proposing this amendment today, Mr. Chairman, not only on my own behalf, but on behalf of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUITE); the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI); the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL); the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN); the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LEHMAN); the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH); the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ESHLEMAN); the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FORSYTHE); and the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. TOWELL), these being the gentlemen who joined with me in signing the additional views to this bill which are printed in the committee report which each one of the Members has.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which we have offered is, as I indicated during general debate, a very simple amendment. It proposes to take the bill which is before us and provide that wherever the word "drug" appears, the words "and alcohol" be added immediately following. The amendment deals with several different forms in which that would be necessary to be done in order to accomplish the goal about which I spoke.

It is unfortunate that there is ambiguity in the use of the word "drug," and confusion as to whether alcohol is indeed a drug. However, there is no question whatsoever and there is no confusion whatsoever, Mr. Chairman, about the fact that alcohol abuse is one of the Nation's most urgent national health problems.

We set forth in the committee report data relative to what the Army has learned. I commend that to the attention of the members of the committee. Those who have had a chance to read the October 29 issue of U.S. News & World Report are aware of the article there indicating that the Nation's No. 1 drug problem is alcoholism.

An article appearing in the Washington Post under date of July 10, 1973, starts off by saying that drinking problems have replaced drug abuse in the Army and Navy and dwells on the tremendous difficulties that have arisen as the Army and the Navy have gone forward in trying to deal with drug abuse. They have found that alcohol abuse time after time after time appears at the head of the list and by itself stacks up as something about which much needs to be done in the field of education.

Alcohol has been termed by at least one expert "America's No. 1 drug of abuse," including the National Commis-

sion on Marihuana and Drug Abuse I think this statement is a grimly accurate description of the immense problem which alcohol abuse and addiction has become in the United States today. In my opinion, it is most regrettable that alcohol abuse has not been a major focus of the Drug Abuse Education Act in its 3 years of existence, and I have concluded that the specific language which we are suggesting is necessary to insure that programs funded under this act will put a major emphasis on alcohol abuse.

There are approximately 9 million alcoholics in the United States today—about 4.5 percent of our population. Alcoholism has become a major cause of increasing absenteeism on the job, and companies as well as unions are struggling with the question of how to cope with this problem. Furthermore, alcohol abuse has created the cause of one-half of all traffic accidents resulting in fatalities in this Nation: the drunk driver.

In the face of facts such as these, there is surely no question about the need for more and better education on alcohol abuse. There is a question in some people's minds, however, as to whether alcohol is already included in the definition of "drug." In fact, the amendment which my colleagues and I are offering today was narrowly defeated in committee, primarily on the grounds that alcohol is already considered a drug and, therefore, it would be redundant to list it separately in the bill.

Personally, I have no problem with the question of whether alcohol is a drug; in fact, I am convinced it is indeed a drug with very deadly potential. I am equally convinced, however, that many people put alcohol into a separate category from the substances most commonly categorized as drugs.

Dr. Helen Knowliss, the Director of the Office of Education's Drug Education/Health and Nutrition Program, has said:

Alcohol is a good example for understanding how a drug works because most people are familiar with it.

She added, however:

Unfortunately, many Americans are reluctant to even think of alcohol as a drug.

I do not think it would make much difference if every single Member of this body were to agree today that alcohol is in fact a drug. The point is that we simply cannot afford to take for granted that those people who will be charged with interpreting and applying this bill will treat alcohol the same as other drugs. I believe we need explicit provision in the law that funding can be used to create and operate programs directed toward the prevention of alcohol abuse.

The contention that alcohol is already part of drug education projects funded under the Drug Abuse Education Act is just not borne out by information from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. According to a survey conducted by HEW:

One could say that 16 of the total of 111 projects are specifically identifiable with concern about alcohol (or better than 10 percent).

To me such statistics illustrate that far from being emphasized in drug abuse

education programs, alcohol abuse is even being ignored in many of these programs.

Alcohol abuse has already ruined the lives of far too many people in the United States. The problem is urgent. Education programs authorized by this legislation could help young people across the country become conscious not only about how hard drugs can ruin their lives, but how the abuse of alcohol can do the same.

I urge my colleagues who recognize the seriousness of alcohol abuse to vote for this amendment. We badly need this potentially invaluable educational tool to help our communities cope with what is the Nation's most dangerous drug: alcohol.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is very reluctant opposition, I must say. I wish to commend the gentleman from Oregon for his very valuable contribution. Indeed, he has caused the report of the committee to show much stronger concern over the question of alcohol abuse.

However, my opposition stems from this fact and I think I can show it by the statement the gentleman quoted where he says that drinking has replaced drug abuse as the No. 1 problem.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, both drinking and drug abuse are the same thing. Alcohol is a drug. If we are, in the title of this act, and in the language of the act, enumerating every single abuse of drugs or even three, four, or five of them, the tendency is to cause people to choose up sides. Are we going to have more emphasis placed on the drug alcohol or more emphasis placed on the drug marihuana or more emphasis placed on the drug heroin and so on and so forth? So the title might read the drug abuse and alcohol and heroin and cocaine and marihuana and so on and so on and so on amendments of 1973. This is my prime opposition to this amendment.

I recognize that the gentleman from Oregon is making a valuable contribution, but I think we have adequately taken care of this problem by a strong statement in the report of the committee indicating that we feel very strongly much attention should be paid to alcohol abuse.

I wholeheartedly agree with the gentleman that the No. 1 abuse in the United States today is alcohol. There is no question about it. However, I visited and have visited over the past 3 or 4 years a number of drug abuse education programs in my own congressional district and other districts. He says he got his information from the Office of Drug Information, and I have no reason to doubt that.

But in every single drug abuse program that I have personally visited, alcohol or the abuse of alcohol as a drug has been a component of that drug abuse education program. Maybe it does not achieve the focus that the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) and I would like it to have, but I think the language in the report of the committee should sufficiently take care of that so that we do not have to get into the situation of having to enumerate all the dif-

ferent drugs of abuses. This is the exact effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this legislation dealing with drug abuse education relates to a subject which is serious and complex—even elusive, but it is certainly not nearly as real or as tangible or as extensive as the subject of addiction to alcohol, which would be covered by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

I am confident that this legislation has much more general national application when we include the subject of addiction to alcohol than when we consider solely the subject of addiction to drugs, since the drug problem is primarily an urban and regional problem contrasted to the general nationwide problem which is included when we make specific reference to the subject of addiction to alcohol.

I know that in my own congressional district the problem of alcoholism is acute, and the need for education programs with regard to this subject is certainly one which needs greater emphasis, and a problem which can be effectively covered by this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I might say also that there is a noticeable and recognized diminution insofar as the drug addiction problem is concerned, while, at the same time, we must recognize the dreadful toll which is being taken by alcoholism which continues virtually unabated. So I am hopeful we will recognize today in this legislation, the need for this amendment and will add the important amendment which the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) has offered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

The facts are, there are 7 to 10 million alcoholics in the United States today. This means that at least one in every 20 persons is an alcoholic, and probably 1 in every 12 persons over the age of 18.

Alcohol was a factor in more than 25,000 of the 50,000 fatal car accidents in 1970. It is estimated that one in every 50 automobiles on the highway is operated by a drunk driver.

The personal cost of alcoholism is as high as that of drug abuse. The life expectancy of alcoholic drinkers is 10 to 12 years shorter than that of the general public. Studies indicate that the mortality rate for such persons is at least two and a half times as great, and they suffer a disproportionate number of violent deaths.

One of the major problems in combating alcohol abuse is its social acceptance. There is no reason why alcohol abuse should not be included in an education program designed to prevent the waste and debilitation of thousands of young

lives, when the statistics show that alcohol abuse is far from a small problem.

In my own Dade County, the schools have adopted the approach of "substance" abuse, which includes both drugs and alcohol. I think this is an excellent approach to the entire problem.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. Chairman, without taking up too much time of the Members, may I say that last Saturday morning I had 16 people who are responsible for fighting drug abuse problems in the city of Seattle in my office back in my home district, and among discussions that we had was that of this very amendment that the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) are offering. Every one of them unanimously agreed that it would help them and would improve the total problem if Congress spelled it out that alcohol and drugs are synonymous, and synchronize them. And while we may not agree with the enforcement and some of the legal aspects when it comes to education, it is essential that there is a coordinated program, and that alcohol is included with drugs.

I think that while we here say that everyone knows it, the public does not know it. I think it establishes that right here and now we declare alcohol as a drug.

I very strongly support Mr. DELLENBACK's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the principal reason given by the committee for not including the words "and alcohol" in the bill (H.R. 9456) was the contention that alcohol is already considered to be a drug and, ipso facto, it would be redundant to so list it in the bill. While it is absolutely true that alcohol is a drug, in common conversation and public thinking, it often fits in a separate category.

The contention that alcohol is part of drug abuse education projects is not borne out by information compiled by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which conducted a survey on this very question. The HEW survey and "Special Analysis" indicated that less than 15 percent of all drug education program projects sampled included alcohol-related problems in their curriculums.

It is scandalous to think that drug education programs such as those authorized by this legislation do not focus in on the Nation's number one drug problem: alcoholism.

The National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse said recently:

Alcohol dependence is without question the most serious drug problem in this country today. Use of the drug is pervasive within the general population and its ready availability facilitates the development of high degrees of dependence among vulnerable populations.

What is even more tragic is that the biggest rise in drinking is seen among young people. And these are the same

people we are attempting to reach with this legislation. Increasing evidence indicates that young Americans are becoming wary of heroin, LSD, and other drugs and are switching back to alcoholic beverages for their "highs."

The National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse said that the proportion of high school students who drink has nearly doubled in the past 4 years—from 39 percent in 1969 to 74 percent in 1972.

What concerns authorities even more is an increase in arrests of young people for intoxication.

Arrests of girls 18 and younger on this charge have tripled in the past decade, and arrests of boys the same age have jumped by 250 percent in the same period, according to Dr. Morris Chafetz, Director of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.

So numerous are the problem drinkers becoming among the young that Alcoholics Anonymous has begun opening local groups exclusively for them all over the Nation. Yet, Federal drug abuse education programs place no emphasis on alcohol-related problems.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the article "Rising Toll of Alcoholism: New Steps To Combat It" appear in the RECORD at this point along with two tables that point to alcoholism as the number one drug problem and to the increased usage of alcohol by youths.

TABLE I. The Nation's No. 1 drug problem: Alcohol

(Based on studies by the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse)
[Percentage of people surveyed reporting use within past seven days]

	Youths	Adults
Alcoholic beverages	24	53
Tobacco, cigarettes	17	38
Proprietary sedatives, tranquilizers, stimulants	6	7
Marijuana	14	16
LSD, other hallucinogens	4.8	4.6
Glue, other inhalants	6.4	2.1
Cocaine	1.5	3.2
Heroin	6.6	1.3

TABLE II. Youthful Drinking on the Upswing
(Based on studies by the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse)

	[Percentage who have used alcoholic beverages]
JUNIOR HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS	
1969	42
1972	56
HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS	
1969	39
1972	74

RIISING TOLL OF ALCOHOLISM: NEW STEPS TO COMBAT IT

Under way in the U.S. is a drive to mobilize the nation's resources against alcoholism—an old problem now back on the nation's doorstep, bigger than ever.

As the number of Americans with a drinking problem keeps rising across America—

Federal spending for the treatment and prevention of alcoholism, and research into its causes, has increased sixfold since 1970 to 86 million dollars a year.

Alcoholics Anonymous—a private organization whose members offer mutual support to each other in getting off alcohol and staying off—has grown from 4,755 groups in 1958 to more than 10,000 groups around the country now.

Many of the nation's largest employers,

concerned about financial losses because of alcoholic personnel, are instituting programs designed to find workers with drinking problems and see that they get treatment.

A PROBLEM AMONG YOUNG

The nation's public-school systems, in an effort to combat a serious increase in youthful drinking problems, are sponsoring alcohol-education programs aimed at students in high school, junior high and even elementary school.

Additional help comes from the Division of Distilled Spirits, Council of the U.S., Inc., which represents the liquor industry.

The council sponsors advertisements in newspapers and on television spelling out the dangers of excessive drinking, provides grants of up to \$12,000 for research into the nature, treatment and possible cures of alcoholism, and helps underwrite costs of educational materials on alcohol for public schools.

Behind this activity is a growing awareness of the massive problems being caused by alcohol abuse in the U.S.

The National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse said recently:

"Alcohol dependence is without question the most serious drug problem in this country today. Use of the drug is pervasive within the general population and its ready availability facilitates the development of high degrees of dependence among vulnerable populations."

In all, 9 million persons—about 10 percent of the nation's drinkers—are described as alcoholics. Twenty-five percent or more are women, and 5 percent are persons aged 10 through 19.

Some wind up on skid row. But 95 per cent are living at home and usually holding jobs—while making life miserable for some 36 million family members and close friends.

CAUSE OF 80,000 DEATHS?

Total cost to the nation—human and financial—are seen as enormous.

Alcoholism is found to be breaking up marriages, impoverished families and displacing children from their homes. It is blamed for 80,000 deaths a year, including half of all traffic fatalities and homicides and a fourth of all suicides.

Almost half of the 5.5 million arrests annually in the U.S. are related to abuse of alcohol. Officials estimate the cost for arrest, trial and jailing of drinkers at more than 100 million dollars a year.

Altogether, alcoholism now is said to be costing society around 15 billion dollars annually.

Of this, 10 billion dollars is lost by the nation's employers because of absenteeism and low productivity by alcoholic personnel, who are said to be absent from work about 2½ times as frequently as their co-workers.

FROM DRUGS TO BOOZE

The biggest rise in drinking is seen among young people, who are becoming wary of heroin, LSD and other such drugs and are switching back to alcoholic beverages for their "highs." The National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse said that the proportion of high-school students who drink has nearly doubled in the past four years—from 39 per cent in 1969 to 74 per cent in 1972.

What concerns authorities even more is an increase in arrests of young people for intoxication.

Arrests of girls aged 18 and younger on this charge have tripled in the past decade, and arrests of boys the same age have jumped by 250 per cent in the same period, said Dr. Morris E. Chafetz, director of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.

So numerous are problem drinkers becoming among the young that Alcoholics Anonymous

mous has begun opening local groups exclusively for them all over the nation.

SOBER AT AGE 11

At one meeting of an AA "youth" organization in California's San Fernando Valley, The Los Angeles Times reported, one member was honored for his first year of sobriety. He was 11 years of age.

At the same meeting, a 10-year-old boy reported he had been sober for a month.

What is causing this youthful binge?

A 30-year-old alcoholic, a member of an AA group in Washington, D.C., who started drinking when he was 17 years of age, offered this explanation:

"Kids are getting scared of drugs. They feel safer with a bottle. They don't see alcohol as addictive, and it's more socially acceptable. For one thing, it is legal.

"Besides, parents encourage their kids to drink, rather than to do drugs. I went to a wedding of a teen-age couple not long ago, and the parents served beer at the reception. They said it was better to have kids drunk on beer than off somewhere lighting up joints."

Another factor: the growing popularity, especially among the young, of "pop" wine. Sales of this generally inexpensive and sweet wine have soared from 3 million gallons in 1968 to 33 million in 1971, the latest available figures.

Many young people are mixing alcohol with other drugs, such as marijuana, barbiturates and amphetamines, to get a "double high."

ONE MAN'S EXPERIENCE

A 22-year-old member of Alcoholics Anonymous in Washington, D.C., who started drinking at 14 explains:

"I drank to get drunk as fast as possible. I was putting down beer, wine, whisky, even rubbing alcohol. Then I started taking pills—mostly amphetamines and acid—to speed up the process. Man, I had blackouts that lasted from three to 18 hours."

Students of alcoholism point out that this young man's experience is rare. They say the large majority of young people experience no serious problem because of drinking. They note that, for untold generations, youngsters have been taking that first drink as a rite of passage into adulthood.

Still, knowledge that youths in their teens and even younger can develop alcoholism comes as a shock to many Americans. Until recently, it was commonly thought that five to 10 years of heavy drinking were needed to become an alcoholic.

During the 1960s, however, researchers learned that extremely heavy abuses of alcohol could produce a drinking problem for some in just two or three years.

In addition, authorities found that between 5 and 10 per cent of the nation's alcoholics had suffered a mysterious reaction to their first drink, which induced an uncontrollable physical need for alcohol—making them alcoholics from the very beginning.

Medical authorities, however, say steady progress is being made in treating the nation's alcoholics.

A VERY COMPLEX DISEASE

They point out that alcoholism is no longer considered a product of moral degeneracy, but is recognized by the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association and the World Health Organization as a highly complex disease which can be treated and brought under control.

As a result, more and more alcoholics who once would have been arrested and thrown into "drunk tanks" are now being treated by doctors and other specialists in hospitals, community-health centers and other treatment facilities.

Perhaps fewer than 20 per cent of the alcoholics are ever able to abstain totally from liquor for more than three to five years.

Some purists believe that no alcoholic who

suffers an occasional relapse and gets drunk is truly recovered.

Many leading authorities, however, say that with an intensive, long-range treatment program, between 60 and 80 per cent can learn to control their drinking most of the time. As a result, despite occasional bouts with drinking, they are able to re-establish normal family life, rebuild their work record and restore their reputation in the community.

How to reach such people is emerging as the most difficult aspect of treating alcoholism.

Nearly always, alcoholism specialists say, the problem drinker is unwilling to admit what his family and associates have long known—that he's in trouble. One alcoholic, a federal official in Washington, D.C., explained:

"If I were to call you an alcoholic, it would ruin you in today's society. Your family would be ashamed of you, your friends would avoid you, and your employers would no longer trust you. You would immediately deny it."

For these reasons, alcoholics often fiercely resist admitting their plight—even to themselves—as long as possible. Dr. Nicholas Pace, director of the employer alcoholism-recovery program at the General Motors Corporation's New York executive offices, says it is often necessary to pressure alcoholics into accepting treatment. His conclusion:

"You have to find something that they love more than drinking, and that isn't easy. Once you find it, you have to threaten to take it away, unless they seek treatment."

For many people, especially men, the weapon that persuades them is their job.

Between 25 and 50 employers, including General Motors, American Airlines, Eastman Kodak, Consolidated Edison, the federal civil-service system and the Navy, have instituted programs to find alcoholics on the job and to assist them firmly into treatment programs.

THE GM WAY

Typical is the General Motors project, which is being implemented at each of the company's 110 plants. GM executives instruct supervisors to watch for one of the earliest signs of alcoholism—deteriorating job performance.

Once they have documented evidence, company and union representatives confront the employee with an ultimatum: either correct his problem or lose his job.

If the worker refuses treatment, he is fired—not because of his disease, but because of his poor job performance.

If he decides to accept treatment, and most do, the alcoholic may take sick leave and even receive medical-insurance payments.

The whole matter is kept strictly confidential, so that the alcoholic's fellow employees need never know the nature of the illness.

For other alcoholics, such as the many housewives who drink secretly, different means of pressure must be found. Often relatives, close friends or a spouse can be helpful, authorities say.

One instance: The wife of a Detroit executive refused to admit that she had a drinking problem until she received a deathbed letter from her cancer-stricken husband that persuaded her to enter an alcoholism-treatment program after his death.

FOR SOME, AA

Some alcoholics, it is found, can solve their drinking problem at little or no cost by joining a supportive group such as Alcoholics Anonymous.

The large majority, however, must undergo treatment under medical supervision—which can be long, complicated and expensive.

Detoxification, or "drying out," means hospitalization up to two weeks to sober up the alcoholic and withdraw him from physical addiction with the aid of tranquilizers and sedatives.

In extreme cases, treatment may also include extensive psychological and social therapy.

Persons with extreme addiction to alcohol may enter "halfway houses," or rehabilitation centers, for weeks or months to live with other recuperating alcoholics under the guidance of trained staff workers. Staff members are often ex-alcoholics themselves.

Others may live at home, but attend outpatient clinics for the same kind of counseling. In either case, alcoholics get help in solving the personal problems which helped cause their drinking. Often included are job services and psychotherapy.

ONE AID: ANTABUSE

To help them stay sober during this interim period, alcoholics are often given a drug called disulfiram or Antabuse. If they take a drink after swallowing an Antabuse tablet, they will suffer a pounding headache and usually violent nausea and vomiting.

Even after months of treatment, alcoholics do not find it easy to stay sober, according to experts. They are forced to revise their whole life style to exclude alcohol. Some turn to religion, while others rely upon a close-knit family relationship or membership in Alcoholics Anonymous.

In all, however, only 10 per cent of the nation's 9 million alcoholics have been treated. The reason, aside from the reluctance of the alcoholics to seek treatment, is that society has been slow to recognize alcoholism for what it has been officially declared—a disease.

Few doctors are trained to recognize alcoholic symptoms. In fact, many doctors, unconvinced that alcoholism is a disease, prefer not to treat patients with the symptoms.

Fewer than 50 percent of the nation's hospitals will admit patients with a primary diagnosis of alcoholism. In most cities, public drunks are still being arrested and thrown into jail. Many in the advanced stages of alcoholism are being housed in mental hospitals with little treatment.

ROLE OF NEW INSTITUTE

Nevertheless, the picture is brightening. With federal grants from the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, created by unanimous act of Congress in 1970, most community mental-health centers around the country are now offering treatment for alcoholics.

The Institute also sponsors medical research into the nature and possible methods of treating alcoholism. It operates the Laboratory of Alcohol Research at St. Elizabeths Hospital in Washington, D.C.

In addition, the Institute provides a total of 7.5 million dollars a year in research grants to such institutions as the Center for Alcohol Studies at Rutgers University, the University of Maryland Medical School and the Massachusetts General Hospital.

Alcoholics are getting increasing help from the private sector. Voluntary programs, run by such organizations as Alcoholics Anonymous, the Salvation Army and Volunteers of America, are reported growing steadily.

Alcoholics Anonymous, for example, estimates that its membership—which has now reached 650,000—is expanding by about 10 per cent a year.

Insurance companies, such as Blue Cross-Blue Shield and Employers Insurance of Wausau, are beginning to include some coverage for the treatment of alcoholism in their health-insurance policies.

Other antialcoholism groups have mounted an intensive public-education campaign. Youth-oriented organizations such as the Young Men's Christian Association and the National Congress of Parents and Teachers are developing programs to alert school-age children to the problems caused by alcohol abuse.

Experts realistically admit that the nation

will always have some alcoholics, but they are convinced that, with the growing array of treatment techniques and increased awareness of this age-old problem, the number of lives destroyed by alcoholism can be drastically reduced.

"ALCOHOLICS" AND "PROBLEM DRINKERS"— THE SYMPTOMS

Of the more than 90 million Americans who drink beer, wine and liquor, as many as 10 per cent are classified as "alcoholics," and millions of others are "problem drinkers." What are the signs of these two conditions—and the differences between them?

ALCOHOLICS

Dr. Frank Seixas, medical director of the National Council on Alcoholism, reports that alcoholics exhibit specific symptoms, including these:

They are physically dependent upon alcohol. When cut off from it, they suffer a painful withdrawal, experiencing tremors, hallucinations, seizures and delirium tremens—the "d.t.s." Withdrawal can become "a medical emergency," producing fevers up to 107 degrees, which can bring death.

Alcoholics develop high tolerance to the effects of alcohol; that is, they are able to drink great quantities without showing easily noticeable signs of intoxication. A typical alcoholic weighing 180 pounds, for example, can consume a fifth of whisky or an equivalent amount of beer or wine each day for several days in a row, with acquaintances unaware that he has a drinking problem.

During their drinking bouts, alcoholics suffer blackout periods that last hours, days and even weeks. They may be conscious and active and appear to be normal. Later they cannot remember what they have done or where they have been.

They fall victim to alcohol-associated illnesses, such as cirrhosis of the liver, alcoholic hepatitis and heart disease. Doctors have found that the life span of the average alcoholic is 10 to 12 years shorter than the rest of the population.

Alcoholics are psychologically dependent on drink, complaining they have lost control over their consumption. They continue to drink, even after losing their jobs, their marriage and their health.

PROBLEM DRINKERS

The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism says that problem drinkers are those who may not yet be full-fledged alcoholics, but whose drinking seriously and adversely affects their lives. Symptoms:

Drinking regularly in order to function or to "cope" with life.

Drinking to get drunk frequently.

Going to work intoxicated.

Driving a car while drunk.

Requiring medical attention because of drinking.

Getting into trouble with the law while drinking.

Doing something while drunk a person would never do sober.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon has considerable merit. Without taking a stand on whether or not I will support his particular amendment, I do wish to point out something, however, which bothers me a great deal. I think all of us recognize the evils of alcohol as a drug. I think we are aware of the tremendous losses caused in this country through the use of alcohol, the tremendous fatality rate from automobile accidents, involving drunk drivers, and the families that are

disrupted by alcoholism. Alcohol is involved in 85,000 deaths in the United States annually. One-half of all homicides and one-third of all deaths reported as suicides are known to be alcohol-related. And yet we do not hesitate to arise on the floor and speak of all of these things, and then go home and have a few drinks of Scotch or bourbon or whatever it is we happen to like. That type of hypocrisy permeates our whole attitude toward alcohol and toward a number of other deleterious substances in our society.

We could put quite a few millions of dollars into education as to the adverse effects of alcohol, and it would not begin to equal the impact of the advertising which the liquor industry puts into the media of this country. Whether we like the idea or not, this advertising constitutes a very effective education as to the benefits of using alcohol. Liquor in all its forms is held up to us in the pages of our national magazines and in the other media as the sort of thing that is necessary for the good life.

I rather doubt the efficacy of spending the few million dollars contained in this legislation to counteract that very effective education as to the benefits of alcohol, a type of education which has had and is continuing to have an enormous impact on our society. It is very nice to make speeches here about education regarding alcoholism. We can send copies of them to the local chapters of the WCTU and similar organizations, to show our concern, but if we really want to do something effective about the use and abuse of alcohol, I suggest that we all support a bill which I put in a few days ago, H.R. 11106, which would disallow liquor advertising as a business expense tax deduction, and thus make it a little bit more difficult for the liquor industry to carry on the kind of education as to the values of alcohol that it has been doing. I think this is the only realistic way to handle the situation, if we truly believe that alcoholism is a threat.

We are really just wasting money to engage in an education program about the dangers of alcohol as long as tens of millions of dollars continue to be spent by the liquor industry urging us to imbibe alcohol because it is a mark of the good life.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I agree that this would sound like a very worthy amendment, and if there were some way that it would help to reduce the 9 million alcoholics in our country, I would be offering an amendment to double or triple the authorization. But I have sat in subcommittee, as have other people who are here proposing this legislation, and heard Dr. Peter Bourne, the assistant director of SAODAP, tell us that there has been no educational program yet devised that has a proven value in reducing the use of drugs; and to add alcohol onto this, into this whole situation, now would, to my notion, be a doubling of the counterproductivity of the program.

What would these educational millions be spent for? Would we teach kids, as we presently do in the drug abuse education programs, how to go down to the drugstore and buy a few aspirins and a coke and thereby put together a short trip? Or are we going to teach them how to make home brew after school by taking potato peelings and fermenting them behind the cookstove?

Are we going to give them some basic ideas on how to become a real drunkard a little later in life?

I know there are some people here who are snickering about this, but I am telling the gentlemen this is an important matter we are talking about today. It is not just a matter of appropriating a few more million dollars. We are dealing with our young people. We have already spent millions and millions and millions of dollars on drug education and what have we got but a spreading cancer in our schools?

Dr. Bourne testified that the U.S. Government ought to be spending its money on research in finding and developing the educational programs that would be productive, that would tend to lessen the interest of kids in drugs, rather than the other way around. I quoted in my earlier speech one high school group in Los Angeles alone where more than 33 1/3 per cent of the kids really thought they were getting an education in how to use drugs.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDGREBE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I recall the day Dr. Helen Knowliss, Director of the Office of Drug Abuse Education, appeared before the committee. In response to a question I put to her about whether or not the Federal Government was justified in terminating support for drug abuse education programs on the grounds that the Office of Management and Budget had set forth, namely, that sufficient models had been produced under the Act so as to make it unnecessary for continued Federal support, she responded:

I know of no models that I will stand behind at this point.

The point of that response was precisely the problem that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. LANDGREBE) addresses, which is to say we very much need more research into the best way of teaching about the abuse of dangerous drugs.

I strongly agree with the plea of the gentleman for more research, and I remind him that is one of the principal purposes of the bill under consideration. I hope therefore the gentleman will reconsider his position in light of what he has just said, and support the bill.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to yield any further.

I would like to point out that the Administration, the President is trying to consolidate the approaches to the drug abuse problem in our country. I am sure the President will be happy to talk about the alcoholism problem as well in this consolidated effort, but to have several hundred programs scattered all over the country and printing textbooks that have no proven value could very well bring

the 9 million alcoholics up to 14 million in a few years time.

Therefore I encourage the Members to deal very seriously with this bill. I urge the Members to defeat the amendment and then to defeat the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this is alleged to be a Drug Abuse Education Act and now another dimension has been proposed by amendment to make it the Abuse the Booze Act.

As I suggested a little earlier this afternoon, why should we not have a Coffee Abuse Education Act? We hear today that coffee drinking is conducive to heart trouble. Is there anything more sinister than heart trouble? I had intended to offer an amendment to include coffee drinking but I will forgo that for today. I am sure there will be another of these educational acts in the near future. "Education" can be made to cover almost anything and does when there is \$90 million to be spent on the bureaucracy.

How many millions are already being spent on "educating" people to the sins of liquor and drug abuse?

Then there is "the pill." Why not a Pill Abuse Act? We hear that the pill may produce deformed children. There is no end to this business. Why not a Nicotine Abuse Act? I have a little experience with nicotine, and am prepared to give the Members some advice on that and it will not cost them \$90 million.

But, when are we going to get around to enacting a Taxpayer Abuse Act? Let the Members remember that tomorrow they will be confronted with a bill to increase the debt ceiling by about \$13 billion.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman from Iowa in being opposed to this bill on the grounds that it is a very expensive duplication of programs now being carried on by other Government and voluntary organizations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of much of anything to which the word "abuse" could not be applied.

What we badly need, insofar as drug abuse is concerned, are a few judges in the country who will convict drug pushers, send them to prison and toss away the keys. That would do more to curb drug abuse than anything else. We can go on endlessly with this kind of business.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill is defeated. Let us save the taxpayers \$90 million.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time, not so much to address myself to the amendment under consideration, but to respond to some of the points which have been made earlier in the debate. I realize it may be possible to talk about the danger of the abuse of milk or coffee and, in effect, to pour ridicule on the question of the abuse of dangerous drugs. But, I want to suggest very

earnestly, Mr. Chairman, that this is no laughing matter. The abuse of dangerous drugs in the United States, especially among young people, is not something to joke about. It is not a laughing matter.

According to the Select Committee on Crime's report to this House last summer, 45 percent of the high school students in the city of New York and 20 percent of the junior high school students are drug users. According to the report of the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, the incidence of the use of heroin and other opiates has increased from 2 percent in 1969 to 6 percent in 1972 among secondary school and college students.

That is a lot of human beings using, not coffee, not milk, but heroin.

There may be some Members of this body who think that is a subject for joking. I do not think that is a subject for joking, and I think that anyone who reflected soberly on this problem, that has caused as much pain and anguish in this country as perhaps any other, will realize that the time for laughing is over and that we had better conduct ourselves as sober, serious-minded legislators concerned about the Nation's business.

Mr. Chairman, I hope therefore that this legislation will have the overwhelming support of all responsible Members of this body.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his remarks. As a former member of the Select Committee on Crime, I concur in the remarks of the gentleman.

I joined in the Crime Committee's tour to major U.S. cities and interviewed the students in the high schools and grammar schools.

The problem of drug abuse was of epidemic proportions.

I agree with the gentleman from Iowa's concern about our spending levels, but the spending of \$90 million for this program is money well spent. We could not spend any money more wisely than we are doing in this program.

I agree with the gentleman from Indiana. This is not a laughing matter. It is a serious matter.

I rise in support of H.R. 9456, legislation to extend the Drug Abuse Education Act for 3 years. Witnesses who testified before the committee represented a wide variety of interests: educators, health specialists, state and local officials. All testimony, including that by administration officials, agreed that conditions were much improved since the passage of the 1970 act. All testimony, excluding that by administration representatives, suggested that an extension of the 1970 act was the best way to guarantee continued progress in the fight against drug use in the schools. I believe in staying with a program which has proven successful rather than changing in midstream.

Administration officials emphasize the successes of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and argue that a consolidation of drug education efforts

within SAODAP is the next step in eliminating the drug scourge. This argument seems logical until we examine past administration efforts to consolidate. Consolidation of programs is often the first step along the road to the elimination of these programs.

The committee report reminded us that administration witnesses used similar reasoning to oppose enactment of the 1970 act. The administration witnesses argued in 1970 that there was no need to pass legislation in order to allocate funds for drug education. They proposed that the National Institute of Mental Health was already in operation and, in fact, in the business of dispensing drug education funds. It was later discovered, however, that NIMH earmarked less than \$1 million for these drug education projects.

The committee's minority views point to recent reports which label drug abuse education not only ineffective but counterproductive. The implication is that drug education per se is dangerous. The real conclusion to be drawn should be that inadequacies of drug education programs rather than the programs themselves are the culprits. There is substantial support for this view in the technical papers of the second report of the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse. Emphasis should be on improving drug education rather than eliminating it.

One article, "Perspectives on Drug Education" by Dr. Gerald Edwards, deserves attention. Dr. Edwards notes that many programs originate in response to intense community pressure for action. These programs are often ill-conceived because of hurried beginnings. Personnel lack expertise, programs lack direction and, in general, in Dr. Edwards' words, there is "tokenism in response to crisis."

Dr. Edwards argues that successful drug education programs offer a constructive alternative to drug abuse rather than stressing the need to take drugs away from users. He spells out what he means by constructive alternatives: Sports, yoga, transcendental meditation, theater, poetry, art, dancing, job development and placement, racial cultural and men's and women's consciousness raising and referral to relevant outside agencies.

A significant number of articles and reports on effective drug education programs stress the need for student involvement in planning and implementing the programs. Youngsters are often more knowledgeable about drugs than teachers and there is no reason for teachers to address students in condescending manner. A teacher who never smoked marijuana cannot preach the evils of "the weed" to students who have tried it and liked it.

Dr. Donald A. McCune's article entitled "An Analysis of the Role of the State in Drug Education" noted the distinction between traditional drug education and effective drug education. The former instilled fear through scare tactics. McCune argued the need to utilize research and knowledge from all social and scientific fields. He further argued the need to enhance the individual drug

user's or prospective drug user's concept of self. He added that drug education programs which fail to implement these newer approaches are bound to fail.

Drug education is not a new thing. In another article, Dr. McCune notes that a California statute of 1887 permitted instruction in the schools "upon the nature of alcohol and narcotics and their effects upon the human system." Dr. McCune suggests that certain schools today are employing the same techniques employed almost a century ago. He is not surprised, therefore, that some drug education programs have been total failures. He would have been surprised if this had not been the case.

As noted in an article about drug use in the city of Boston:

Didactic and informational drug education programs upon which we have too heavily relied, spotted here and there throughout our schools on an occasional schedule, appear to be largely ineffectual and may well increase the incidence of drug use.

The shift in emphasis from the symptoms of drug abuse to the causes of drug abuse is essential. The replacement of the negative approach by a positive one is heralded as the beginning of real progress in schools by drug experts.

Administration spokesmen who argued against this legislation admitted there had been no attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of the programs funded under the Drug Abuse Education Act. An attempt should be made to identify those programs which are working and those which are not. After such an evaluation is made, the effective programs should be suggested as models. Without the benefit of this evaluation, however, I cannot understand the administration's opposition to extending the Drug Abuse Education Act.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in support of the amendment.

Alcohol is technically a drug. We all know that. In my opinion it serves a laudable purpose to add the word "alcohol" to this legislation.

I would call for an "aye" vote on this side of the aisle.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESHLEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, let me say I agree with most of what the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEN) said a few minutes ago. This is not the time for ridicule. This is not the time for humor. We are dealing with an extremely important issue.

Are we going to take our young people and give them the best education we can give them as to the danger of abuse of drugs?

The answer should be a clear, ringing "yes."

As far as the National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse is concerned, the report to which the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEN) made reference, let me read another section of it:

The most widely used mood-altering drug in America is alcohol. Retail sales of alcohol . . . in 1971 amounted to \$24.2 billion.

The Commission has also said:

Alcohol dependence is without question the most serious drug problem in this country today.

We are not here dealing with even a minor part of the area of drug abuse. We are dealing, when we talk about adding the words "and alcohol," with the most pernicious drug of the lot. It is extremely important that these words be added.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment and then proceed overwhelmingly to adopt this legislation.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in favor of the amendment. In my judgment, alcohol should be added to the bill simply because alcohol education is just as important as education about other drugs.

In the school districts in my congressional district, alcohol is a big problem. It would be wasteful to develop a drug education program and not include alcohol, far more widely and less carefully used than drugs.

I think this good bill, H.R. 9456, would be greatly improved by adding alcohol to the drug education program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. REES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9456) to extend the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 for three years, pursuant to House Resolution 656, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. As a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted in the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I ob-

ject to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 372, nays 13, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 554]

YEAS—372

Abdnor	Dellums	Hunt
Abzug	Denholm	Hutchinson
Adams	Dennis	Ichord
Addabbo	Derwinski	Jarman
Alexander	Devine	Johnson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.	Diggs	Johnson, Colo.
Andrews, N.C.	Dingell	Johnson, Pa.
Andrews,	Donohue	Jones, N.C.
N. Dak.	Dorn	Jones, Okla.
Annuzio	Downing	Jones, Tenn.
Archer	Drinan	Jordan
Arends	Dulski	Karth
Armstrong	Duncan	Kastenmeier
Ashley	du Pont	Kazen
Badillo	Eckhardt	Kemp
Bafalis	Edwards, Ala.	Ketchum
Baker	Edwards, Calif.	Koch
Barrett	Elberg	Kuykendall
Bauman	Erlenborn	Kyros
Beard	Esch	Landrum
Bennett	Eshleman	Latta
Bergland	Evans, Colo.	Leggett
Bevill	Evins, Tenn.	Lehman
Blester	Fascell	Lent
Bingham	Findley	Litton
Blackburn	Fish	Long, La.
Boggs	Fisher	Long, Md.
Boland	Flood	Lott
Bolling	Flowers	McClory
Bowen	Flynt	McCollister
Brademas	Foley	McCormack
Brasco	Ford, Gerald R.	McDade
Bray	Ford,	McEwen
Breckinridge	William D.	McFall
Brinkley	Forsythe	McKay
Broomfield	Fraser	McSpadden
Brotzman	Frelinghuysen	Macdonald
Brown, Calif.	Frenzel	Madden
Brown, Mich.	Frey	Madigan
Brown, Ohio	Freelich	Mahon
Broyhill, N.C.	Fulton	Mailliard
Broyhill, Va.	Fuqua	Mallory
Burgener	Gaydos	Mann
Burke, Fla.	Gettys	Maraziti
Burke, Mass.	Gialmo	Martin, Nebr.
Burleson, Tex.	Gibbons	Martin, N.C.
Burlison, Mo.	Gilman	Mathias, Calif.
Burton	Ginn	Mathis, Ga.
Butler	Goldwater	Matsunaga
Camp	Gonzalez	Mayne
Carey, N.Y.	Goodling	Mazzoli
Carney, Ohio	Gray	Meeds
Carter	Green, Pa.	Melcher
Casey, Tex.	Griffiths	Metcalfe
Cederberg	Grover	Mezvisinsky
Chamberlain	Gubser	Michel
Chappell	Gude	Milford
Chisholm	Guyer	Miller
Clancy	Haley	Minish
Clay	Hamilton	Mink
Cleveland	Hanley	Minshall, Ohio
Cochran	Hanna	Mitchell, Md.
Cohen	Hanrahan	Mitchell, N.Y.
Collier	Hansen, Idaho	Mozley
Collins, Ill.	Harrington	Mozley
Collins, Tex.	Harsha	Mollohan
Conable	Harvey	Montgomery
Conlan	Hastings	Moorhead,
Conte	Hawkins	Calif.
Conyers	Hays	Moorhead, Pa.
Corman	Hébert	Morgan
Cotter	Hechler, W. Va.	Moss
Coughlin	Heckler, Mass.	Murphy, Ill.
Cronin	Heinz	Myers
Culver	Helstoski	Natcher
Daniel, Dan	Henderson	Nedzi
Daniel, Robert	Hicks	Nelsen
W. Jr.	Hillis	Obey
Daniels,	Hinshaw	O'Brien
Dominick V.	Hogan	O'Hara
Danielson	Hollifield	O'Neill
Davis, Ga.	Holt	Owens
Davis, S.C.	Holtzman	Parris
Davis, Wis.	Horton	Passman
de la Garza	Huber	Patman
Delaney	Hudnut	Patten
Dellenback	Hungate	Pepper

Perkins	Sarbanes	Towell, Nev.
Pettis	Scherle	Treen
Peyster	Schneebeli	Udall
Pickle	Schroeder	Ullman
Pike	Sebelius	Van Deerin
Poage	Seiberling	Vander Jagt
Powell, Ohio	Shipley	Vanik
Preyer	Shoup	Vigorito
Price, Ill.	Shriver	Waggonner
Price, Tex.	Sikes	Walsh
Pritchard	Sisk	Wampler
Quie	Skubitz	Ware
Railsback	Slack	Whalen
Randall	Smith, Iowa	White
Rangel	Smith, N.Y.	Whitehurst
Rees	Snyder	Whitten
Regula	Spence	Widnall
Reid	Staggers	Wiggins
Reuss	Stanton	Williams
Rhodes	J. William	Wilson, Bob
Riegle	Stanton	Wilson
Rinaldo	James V.	Charles H.,
Robison, N.Y.	Stark	Calif.
Rodino	Steed	Wilson
Roe	Steelman	Charles, Tex.
Rogers	Steiger, Ariz.	Winn
Roncallo, Wyo.	Steiger, Wis.	Wright
Roncallo, N.Y.	Stephens	Wyatt
Rooney, N.Y.	Stokes	Wyder
Rooney, Pa.	Stubblefield	Wylie
Rose	Studds	Wyman
Rosenthal	Sullivan	Yates
Rostenkowski	Talcott	Yatron
Roush	Taylor, Mo.	Young, Alaska
Roussetot	Taylor, N.C.	Young, Ga.
Roy	Teague, Tex.	Young, Ill.
Roybal	Thompson, N.J.	Young, Tex.
Ruppe	Thomson, Wis.	Zablocki
Ruth	Thone	Zwack
St Germain	Thornton	
Sarasin	Tiernan	

NAYS—13

Ashbrook	Quillen	Symms
Byron	Rarick	Teague, Calif.
Crane	Robinson, Va.	Young, S.C.
Gross	Satterfield	
Landgrebe	Shuster	

NOT VOTING—48

Anderson, Calif.	Grasso	Murphy, N.Y.
Aspin	Green, Oreg.	Nichols
Bell	Gunter	Nix
Blaggi	Hammer-	Podell
Blatnik	schmidt	Roberts
Breaux	Hansen, Wash.	Runnels
Brooks	Hosmer	Ryan
Buchanan	Howard	Sandman
Burke, Calif.	Jones, Ala.	Steele
Clark	Keating	Stratton
Clausen, Don H.	King	Stuckey
Clawson, Del	Kluczynski	Symington
Dent	Lujan	Veysey
Dickinson	McCloskey	Waldie
Fountain	McKinney	Wolff
	Mills, Ark.	Young, Fla.
	Mosher	Zion

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Roberts.
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Runnels.
 Mr. Nichols with Mr. Ryan.
 Mr. Fountain with Mr. Symington.
 Mr. Podell with Mr. Aspin.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Lujan.
 Mr. Howard with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
 Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. King.
 Mr. Waldie with Mr. Stuckey.
 Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Dickinson.
 Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Nix.
 Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. McCloskey.
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Steele.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Del Clawson.
 Mr. Wolff with Mr. Keating.
 Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Young of Florida.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Buchanan.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Mosher.
 Mr. Breaux with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
 Mr. Gunter with Mr. McKinney.
 Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Zion.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during the vote on the drug abuse extension bill. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my statement may appear immediately following the vote in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CHANGE IN LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce a change in the legislative program for this week.

On tomorrow, Wednesday we will call up the conference report on H.R. 9286, military procurement authorization, and H.R. 11104, the public debt limit increase. We are postponing consideration of the conference report on S. 1081, the trans-Alaskan pipeline authorization, probably until next week.

On Thursday we will consider no legislative business because of the services for the late John Saylor. We have postponed a vote on the override of the President's veto of House Joint Resolution 542, the war powers resolution until next Wednesday, and H.R. 10265, audits of the Federal Reserve Board.

Also, we will have no session on Friday.

AMERICAN BUSINESS—THE BEST LINE OF DEFENSE

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Longview Daily News, published at Longview, Tex., which is read by a great many of my constituents, has featured an article on the subject of U.S. trade with Russia which prompts me to make this observation.

Only history can ultimately determine the true thrust of diplomatic negotiations, and pronouncements from Communist countries have always been viewed with particular suspicion; however, there is always the possibility that the most effective smokescreen may be to mean precisely what you say. It seems to me that one of the best safeguards the United States can have in the always

confusing international situation is the sharp eye of the American businessman who knows what he is doing and can be relied upon to get the facts with the greatest possible accuracy and speed and usually with beneficial results to the American people through a favorable balance of payments. In short, the American free enterprise system is in many ways the most effective instrument of our national diplomacy.

The article from the Longview Daily News is as follows:

[From the Longview (Tex.) Daily News, Oct. 17, 1973]

FACING RUSSIA IS A GAMBLE
(By John Chamberlain)

In facing the Russians, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger is taking a gamble. His desire for a detente with the Soviets may be based on an accurate assessment of their own need. On the other hand, an equally good case can be made that Dictator Brezhnev is setting Kissinger up.

The minority view in CIA, Pentagon, and State Department circles, as leaked to our more pessimistic journalists, favors the setting-up theory. The Soviet Minister of Defense, Marshal Andrei Grechko, no lover of the West, sits on the Politburo. He represents the younger elements in the Soviet military establishment, a group described as not at all adverse to using military means to gain results that elude the diplomats. Brezhnev supposedly put Grechko on the Politburo over a detente-minded opposition.

DR. HAMMER'S ARGUMENTS

The argument against the theory that the Soviets are using detente as a smoke screen to hide preparations for a preventive war on Red China or some sudden intervention in the Middle East rests on the application of horse sense to what the Kremlin is trying to do to woo capitalist participation in the exploitation of Russian natural resources. I have always been distrustful of Soviet promises, but Dr. Armand Hammer, the president of the Occidental Petroleum Company, who has several deals now cooking with the Communists, makes a most persuasive argument that the Russians need 20 years of peace with the West in order to move forward with their natural gas reserves, their agriculture, and their foreign trade prospects.

There is little possibility, as Dr. Hammer outlined in an interview with this columnist, of the Soviets gaining anything very ponderable by breaking off in the middle of their complex deals with the West. In conjunction with the El Paso Natural Gas Company, Occidental Oil plans to supply the pipe and the exploratory expertise needed to bring ten to fifteen trillion cubic feet of gas from the Irkutsk region of Siberia to tidewater at Olga, a Pacific port near Vladivostok. The gas will be going in the wrong direction to serve Soviet manufacturing installations; it can only bring the Soviets a good return by shipping it in liquefied form to Japan and the West Coast of the U.S.

Another Occidental deal with the Soviets will take phosphates from Florida to Russian ports to be used as fertilizer. Occidental has a new process that reduces bulky phosphate rock to a concentrate that enables one freighter to do the work of four. The deal is taking \$500 million in financing that is shared by the Ex-Im Bank, the Bank of America, and the Soviets themselves. The pay-back to the U.S. will come in the form of Soviet shipments of nitrogenous fertilizer made from Soviet natural gas. Twenty years are needed for the Soviets to get full advantage of the phosphate-for-nitrogen trade-off.

A third Occidental project is the building of a \$110 million trade center in Moscow, with the Soviets putting up the money and the Bechtel Corporation helping an Occi-

dental subsidiary with the construction. There will be office space for 400 firms, plus apartments for their employees and a 600-room hotel in the trade center. Why, if Moscow intends to go to war with the West, should they be spending money on a center for foreign businessmen?

EXTRACTING OIL FROM GARBAGE

A fourth deal contemplates the bartering of metal plating equipment made by Occidental's Hooker Chemical subsidiary for Soviet nickel. This involves an \$80 million contract covering five years. Finally, Occidental plans to teach the Soviets to extract oil from garbage by a new process scheduled for unveiling in San Diego.

If the Soviets are consciously using the five deals with Occidental as a smokescreen behind which they are plotting something sinister, it would represent the most elaborate hoax ever perpetrated. Potemkin's false-front villages, used to delude Catherine the Great into thinking she was Queen of a prosperous country, would pale into utter insignificance by comparison. With N. G. Osipov, the Soviet Deputy Minister for Foreign Trade, coming to the U.S. with a 21-man delegation to talk reciprocity, Dr. Hammer's theory of 20 years of peace sound plausible. But the Kremlin still has two options, one for peace and one for a quick military strike, and not even the most knowledgeable of experts can know whether Henry Kissinger is going to succeed with his gamble.

SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I have never hesitated to criticize the President when I thought he was wrong, and I will not hesitate to commend him when I think he is right. I have written to the President commending him for the immediate support he gave Israel in her hour of crisis and I am placing a copy of that letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 30, 1973.

RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I want to commend you for the strong and immediate actions you have taken to support Israel. Like you I believe the safety and security of that beleaguered country is in the national interest of the United States as well as a moral imperative. I also am in full accord with your having made it clear to the Soviet Union that this country will not tolerate the Soviet Union's introduction of troops into the Mideast.

In all candor I must say however, Mr. President, that I am distressed over the pressure that our nation is placing on Israel with respect to its encroachment of the Egyptian Third Corps. While I would agree that blood and medical supplies should be furnished for the wounded it is unjust to compel the Israeli Army to permit the re-supplying of the combatants with material, albeit of non-military nature, which would enable that Egyptian Corps to fight on and endanger the security of Israel.

The refusal of the Egyptians and Syrians to provide lists of Israeli POWs in an apparent effort to use these POWs as pawns in future negotiations, is a callous and tragic violation of the Geneva Convention. I urge you, Mr. President, as I am sure you already are doing, to intercede with all of the parties

to make certain that the POWs are treated according to the Convention's accords and to seek their immediate exchange and release.

I also urge you, Mr. President, not to exact conditions of Israel that will jeopardize her national security or diminish the gains she has achieved in a battle that she was forced to fight against her own desire for peace.

In closing, may I again extend my appreciation for the support you have extended to Israel and urge that the United States not accede to demands by the Soviet Union that serve to undermine the security and well-being of that beleaguered country.

I also want to tell you, Mr. President, that I am as distressed as you are at the way in which the NATO countries, including Britain, Germany and France in particular, reacted to the emergency. They turned their back on the State of Israel and on the United States at a time when our mutual defense interests were threatened by Arab and Soviet military actions. I believe the United States must make it clear to our European allies that they cannot ignore America's vital interests if they expect mutual security to work in their behalf.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE WILLIAM B. STREET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUYKENDALL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. KUYKENDALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the attention of this body at this special order in memory of a distinguished newspaperman, the late William B. Street of Memphis. I am also grateful to my colleagues in the House who were Bill Street's friends, who are joining me in this solemn tribute.

It seems strange to use such a word as "solemn" in any remarks about Bill Street—if there was anything that Bill Street was not, it was solemn. He had a love for life and for his profession and for people such as I have never seen. He had a rare gift for telling a story, whether in newsprint under his byline or sitting among friends at the Memphis Press Club or standing on a stage with a microphone in his hand at the Gridiron Show.

His stories could be deflating without being cruel, pointed without being slanted, topical without being tedious, and deep without being ponderous. A special target for his wit and his typewriter was always the pompous politician, and he had a knack for picking precisely the right words to puncture a puffed-up ego. But then he could share a cup of coffee and a joke with that same person, and it was a mark of his career that he numbered thousands of friends, and only a handful of enemies, among the people he wrote for and about.

Bill Street had what I might call the "Will Rogers touch." He had every opportunity to succumb to the temptation of becoming a pontifical writer, carried away by his own wisdom and rhetoric, but he never did; he never lost one ounce of the common touch that was his stock-in-trade.

When I think of him, my memory goes automatically to the little cubbyhole office in the newsroom of the Commercial Appeal, that great newspaper that he loved and served so well, where Bill worked behind a desk piled high with news releases and photos, copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, U.S. News and World Report, all the tools of his trade. There was a rickety chair next to his desk, and every politician in the Mid-south has sat in that chair at one time or another in the past decade, chatting with Bill, swapping stories or digesting his keen analysis of this or that congressional district, or the chances of some new political figure on the horizon—usually someone whose talents had been recognized by Bill Street long before anybody else ever heard of him.

In the days and weeks ahead, I will be back in the newsroom of the Commercial Appeal, because there, more than anywhere else in my district, can I sit and listen to my friends, and be told how the people I represent feel about a given topic or issue—or have my own performance as their representative assessed objectively and accurately. But I will never be able to return there without glancing over at the west wall and that little glassed-in office, and remembering a man with a broad grin on his face and a twinkle in his eye, whose door was always open and to whom "fair play" was more than a phrase—it was a badge of honor.

I request permission to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Commercial Appeal, which sums up the feeling that this great Midsouth newspaper had for one of its most distinguished sons:

"BILL" STREET: ONE OF THE BEST

An axiom of the newspaper profession has it that if a reporter makes both sides on an issue mad at him he must have done a good job. This serves as an adequate standard for most reporters. But the really outstanding ones are so informed, fair and accurate that they usually win the respect and praise of the opposing sides. That's the way it was with William B. Street, the politics editor of The Commercial Appeal, who died Wednesday.

The words of regret that have poured in from politicians throughout the Mid-South testify to "Bill's" standing among them—liberals or conservatives, black or white, Mississippi Gov. Bill Waller said, "His masterful writing on Mississippi political affairs has greatly influenced the course of politics in our state." Shelby County Sheriff Roy C. Nixon said, "His guidance and counsel to people in government and his strict code of ethics should be a lesson to those of us in government for all time." City Councilman and state Sen. J. O. Patterson Jr. called him "one of the finest people I have run into in my political life."

"Bill" Street was not just a byline or the name of a man who called to ask sometimes uncomfortable questions. He was a personality. He deeply respected the political process, but he was quick to deflate one politician's attempts to take himself too seriously or another's underhandedness. He won friends because they knew he acted with utmost integrity and fair-mindedness.

They even remembered "Bill's" humor with affection when it was directed at them. For years he was the mainstay of the Memphis Gridiron Show, which annually roasts politicians and others in public life to raise funds for college scholarships. He taught many a politician to laugh at himself. Members of the show's casts, made up primarily

of "Bill's" colleagues, would often kid him good-naturedly about the obscure hymns and country and western melodies he would pick out to embellish the adroitness of his wit. But the lyrics never left anyone guessing.

"Bill" Street was a professional—one of the most competent and respected political writers in the South. He was also great fun to be with. He stood tall in life. He will continue to do so in memory.

I would like to submit the statement of Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, the President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate:

I learned last week with great sadness my friend and one of the Mid-South's leading newspaper reporters, William B. "Bill" Street, had died. I join my colleagues in the Congress, newspapermen from all over the country, and countless readers of *The Commercial Appeal* in mourning the loss.

Bill Street was what has become known as a "reporter's reporter." But he was also a "politician's reporter." His first love was politics. He started by helping tabulate the election results for the weekly newspaper editor in his hometown of Ripley, Mississippi. When he joined the newspaper in Memphis, Tennessee he moved up steadily from reporter, to assistant Tri-State Editor and to the position that he held when he died, Politics Editor.

He had a keen knowledge of politics—not only in his home state of Mississippi, but in the entire tri-state area served by his newspaper. His column, "Politics Today," was widely read and readers knew they could depend on him to keep them accurately posted on the news of politics.

Bill also had a love for the political anecdote—those stories which grow up over the years and humanize those who call politics their profession. Bill knew them by the hundreds and, strung together, they would have made a best seller.

More than all of this, though, was the high regard that all those who knew Bill Street held for him. He had a certain quality that commanded respect from those who talked with him and read what he wrote. He was an outstanding reporter, a credit to his profession and a good friend of mine. "William B. Street" was a symbol of journalistic excellence and integrity.

I extend my sympathy to his family and to his colleagues.

I would also like to include in the RECORD the comments of Tennessee's senior Senator, the Honorable HOWARD BAKER:

I was deeply saddened to learn of the death last week of William B. Street, the distinguished political editor and columnist of *The Memphis Commercial Appeal*.

Bill Street was a talented and dedicated newsman. Through his personal and perceptive columns, he helped keep his thousands of readers in the Mid-South informed about the often complex and fast moving political developments in Tennessee, Arkansas, and his native Mississippi.

Just as his readers held Bill in high esteem, so, too, did his fellow journalists. He was a man who cared deeply about his profession and volunteered much of his time to its betterment.

Bill was past president and a member of the Board of the Mid-South Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, the national professional journalistic society. He was well known as master of ceremonies of the Memphis Gridiron Show, and as chairman of the Memphis Press Club.

Bill Street was a good newsman, a good citizen, and a good friend. Mrs. Baker joins me in extending our sympathy to the Street family.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I join my colleagues today in this special order to pay tribute to William Boyce Street of Memphis, Tenn. On the morning of October 24, Bill Street died doing the thing he was doing when most of us met him—putting together a newsstory about politics in the Midsouth.

Bill Street had for more than two decades written about the people and developments in Mississippi, Arkansas, and Tennessee, for the *Commercial Appeal*. He had an encyclopedic knowledge of politics in the region and had been politics editor for the *Commercial Appeal* since October 1967.

Bill Street was among the most astute of the political analysts working in the Midsouth throughout his career. He learned to love politics and journalism early in his 46 years. Bill Street achieved a reputation for honesty, integrity, accuracy, and dedication to his profession and to his speciality of political reporting which will long serve as a goal for which his successors will want to strive.

He was one of those elite reporters who love and is a friend to the men and women in politics, but, whose feelings are never allowed to overshadow his consciousness of his responsibility to be objective in reporting their activities. He would offer praise where merited. And, he would give constructive criticism when convinced the holders of elective and appointive office had strayed from their proper roles.

He worked tirelessly in his profession.

His interest in the journalism community was demonstrated by his leadership in such organizations as the Mid-South chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, the Memphis Gridiron Show, Inc., and the Memphis Press Club. As one of the driving forces behind the Gridiron Shows, Bill Street helped many a Midsouth politician to learn to laugh at himself. The effort was for a good cause. The shows have helped raise thousands of dollars which has been used to recognize, through scholarships and awards, the achievements of promising young journalism students in Mississippi, Arkansas, and Tennessee.

When Bill Street succumbed to a massive heart attack while working at his desk this last week the loss was a tragic one not only for his family and profession but for the thousands of us to whom he was a friend.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I will now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague, Mr. KUYKENDALL, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, today we are paying tribute to the late William B. Street, political editor at the *Memphis Commercial Appeal*. When Bill passed away unexpectedly last week I commented in my extension of remarks that southern journalism had lost a leader. This fact was quite obvious to anyone who knew Bill Street.

Today, politicians are going to be pay-

ing grand compliments to his memory, but I dare say that anyone of us would have said the same things to his face. Bill was that kind of person. He put you at ease, talked straight and expected you to do the same. On many occasions I have praised and thanked Bill profusely for his guidance and advice. I did it in person and to his face.

This is not to say that Bill and I always agreed on controversial issues. We did not, but Bill always took issue with you in a gentlemanly fashion and without hostility. This quality gained him the respect of all politicians, liberal, and conservative, Democrat, or Republican.

Many times Bill's insightful and logical columns provided lubrication for the political process in the Midsouth. His columns could reunite factions and heal political wounds or massage bruised political egos. You can be sure that we will miss Bill Street's fine touch.

Within the ranks of the journalistic community, Bill was without a doubt a professional in every sense of the word.

His leadership resulted in many enjoyable hours for us at the annual gridiron show of the Memphis Press Club which he chaired. Those of us who took ourselves a little too serious had this trait pointed out to us, politely but firmly.

However, a larger contribution has been made by Bill's concern for developing young reporters. Whether they were in high school, college, or young professionals, Bill was always there with advice and encouragement. I understand Bill was to have served as toastmaster for a high school journalism clinic 2 days after he died.

Bill's funeral was conducted by Reverend Whitlock, chaplain at the Shelby County jail. He and Bill Street had grown up together in north Mississippi. Reverend Whitlock said that down through the years he often used Bill Street in talks to young people as an example of honesty and integrity in everyday life. He said that Bill's life proved life is worth living.

Everywhere you look you find Bill Street admirers. I am one of many, but no one had more admiration and respect for Bill than I. To me, the loss is personal and I want Mrs. Street and Bill's children to know that I share with them their loss and cherish with them the fond memories.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. BOWEN).

Mr. BOWEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief comment on the life and career of the late Bill Street, political editor of the *Memphis Commercial Appeal*. Bill's death a few days ago came as a great shock to those of us who knew him; it was untimely and left a great void in the newspaper profession, among his many friends, fellow workers, loved ones, and readers.

Bill Street was a newspaperman's newspaperman. He called the shots as he saw them journalistically, but in a firm, reasonable, responsible manner which commanded the respect of those of us about whom he wrote and those of us who read his columns and stories.

He possessed a keen mind, a clear style of writing and the journalistic ability to go to the heart of a story or political campaign and spell out the facts and label his opinions for readers to digest and consider.

It was my privilege to read his columns for a number of years before I entered the active field of politics; since then I became personally acquainted with Bill Street and came to admire and respect him even more, both as a man and as a newspaper writer. I can say without reservation that he was the most widely read and highly regarded political writer in the Midsouth. He will be missed. Men such as Bill Street just do not come along every day. They will miss him in Memphis and at the Commercial Appeal and those of us in north Mississippi who read him faithfully day in and day out will miss him, too. His family and loved ones can take solace in the fact that his life and career will stand as a hallmark at the Commercial Appeal for younger writers to aspire in striving for the high standards he set.

Tragic and untimely as his death was, at age 48 and at the peak of his career, perhaps he would have us note that he died in the finest tradition of great newspapermen who preceded him—at his desk, working on the story of the day. Knowing Bill Street, I do not believe he would have wanted it any other way when the Great Editor stepped into the newsroom last week and wrote "30" to his life and career.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON).

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, honesty, fairness and objectivity are the qualities which create respect in and for the profession of journalism. It is therefore tragic when someone in this field who has achieved these qualities and earned this respect is taken by death at the very prime of his life.

Bill Street, 46, political editor of the Memphis Commercial Appeal, was stricken with a heart attack last week. He died as he lived: at his typewriter.

While it was my privilege to know Mr. Street, my contact with him was minimal because the coverage of his paper does not include my area of the State of Tennessee. Nonetheless, I know many who have dealt with him professionally for many years and to an individual they have high praise for Bill Street as a newspaperman in the finest tradition of the profession and a gentleman of the highest caliber.

His death was untimely and his passing will leave a void difficult to fill. My sympathies are extended to his family and friends.

Mr. BEARD. Mr. Speaker, on October 24 the people of the metropolitan Memphis area and the entire State of Tennessee lost one of the finest political writers the journalism profession has ever known with the death of William B. Street.

Bill, as he was known to his many friends and readers, will be sadly missed by the thousands who for years have started their days with a cup of coffee and "Politics This Morning" in the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

Bill Street was a great reporter. He enjoyed the trust and confidence of all public figures on both sides of the political aisle. But it was not only his ability as a reporter that earned him this trust.

He was an advocate of good, honest government. He was truly concerned about the political process and the people involved in it, and his concern extended far beyond the limits of the normal working day. His was a familiar face at many a political gathering and his opinion was actively sought by many a public figure looking for an honest, unbiased assessment of a situation.

"Fair" is the word spoken most often when remembering Bill Street. If he thought you were right, he told you so. If he thought you were wrong, he did likewise—forthrightly and without malice. He could be blunt and straightforward and had the ability to cut deeply with the stroke of a pen. But he also had a remarkable sense of humor that enabled him to poke good fun at the world of politics and, more important, make politicians laugh at themselves. In these times, especially, it is a quality whose loss will be deeply felt.

Bill Street was a close personal friend who had a tremendous influence on my decision to seek the office I now hold. I held a deep respect for his opinion and his strict code of ethics as did many of my Tennessee colleagues.

He was loyal to these ethics, and it was this loyalty that earned him the highest esteem he enjoyed in Southern politics and journalism. I join my colleagues in expressing my deep sense of personal loss in his most untimely death.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many friends of the late William B. Street who have paid tribute here to his services. It was my privilege to be closely associated with Bill Street from his boyhood on to his untimely death. He came from a fine family; he was possessed of splendid personality, ability, poise, and an ambition matched only by his energy and sense of fairness. His career in the field of journalism was almost entirely spent with the Memphis Commercial Appeal, a splendid newspaper which has served north Mississippi through the years. Bill Street's place on the paper will indeed be hard to fill. His success has served as an incentive to many young people in our State. His contributions to the city of Memphis, to Mississippi and Tennessee and Arkansas and the Midsouth are tremendous and have always been constructive.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to understand the loss of such a fine person at such a young age and at the height of his success. We shall all miss Bill Street and his further contributions which we can so ill afford to lose. We do have with us, however, his fine record of accomplishment and the many fond memories of a close and personal friendship. To his family and loved ones, we express our deepest sympathy in their loss which also is our own.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, certainly I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague from Tennessee (Mr. KUYKENDALL) in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of Mr.

William B. Street of Memphis, the renowned and capable political editor of the Commercial Appeal, known and respected throughout Tennessee and the South for his perceptive writings.

Bill Street was a man of courage, ability, and distinction—his observations and comments were followed by thousands and thousands of readers, including those in public office—and I know he will be greatly missed.

I want to take this means of extending to members of his family this expression of my deepest and most sincere sympathy in their loss and bereavement.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUYKENDALL) for securing this time today in order that I and other Members of the Congress might pay tribute to the long and distinguished career of William B. Street. Like others in the Southeast who had come to regard Bill Street as a friend, I was shocked and saddened to learn of his death on October 24.

During those days I was a member of the Mississippi State Senate, I came to know and respect Bill Street for his integrity and honesty in political reporting. He was one of the very first men that could be truly classified as a political reporter of the Mississippi scene. Through the years, he had turned his attention more to the affairs of Tennessee, but he always kept in close touch with happenings in Mississippi. I always valued his perception of politics in my home State and felt that he had the uncanny ability to get to the specifics of any given situation.

Mr. Speaker, I will miss Bill Street and his reporting and his death will be a great loss to journalism in the South. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the life and memory of William B. Street of Memphis, the political editor of the Commercial Appeal. Bill Street was one of the finest newspapermen in the South and was deeply respected by all those who knew him, either personally or by reputation.

Bill Street was an informed, fair and accurate reporter—a great credit to his profession.

Born in Mississippi, Bill Street became interested in newspaper work at a very early age. He began his career with the Commercial Appeal in 1950, shortly after his senior year at the University of Mississippi. He worked hard and soon won the admiration and trust of those with whom he came in contact. He became especially noted for his knowledge of politics in Tennessee, Arkansas, and particularly Mississippi. In 1967, he became political editor for the Commercial Appeal.

Bill Street was a great American, a man of firm convictions and of deep devotion for the political process of our Nation.

His tragic death was a loss to so many—his family, his associates, and thousands of his daily readers.

I extend to his family my deepest personal sympathy in their bereavement.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ELECTION REFORM: CRITICAL NEED FOR PROMPT ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on House Administration and a cosponsor of the Clean Elections Act of 1973, I wish to share with my colleagues a number of observations concerning political campaign reforms.

This is one of the truly critical legislative matters of this session. Certainly we have enough other problems, ranging from defense and foreign policy to the state of the economy and our energy and human needs. But many of those problems go far beyond individual pieces of legislation. They are more a matter of an evolving national strategy. Not so with campaign reforms; we have specific bills to consider. And speaking of problems, we are face-to-face here with the important ramifications of Watergate.

The measures we are considering offer us a rare opportunity to make real progress on needs too long short-changed with half-way measures. The confidence of the public is low and apparently headed lower. Yet there is strong public support for campaign reforms. This is an encouraging sign that the public still has faith in the long-term ability of our system to reform itself. Congress has an obligation to sustain that faith and to restore the confidence of the electorate in government, the two-party system and particularly in the Congress.

OVERRIDING ISSUE: PUBLIC TRUST

Indirectly it involves more than a single issue. Our ability to deal with any controversial issue or complex problem depends on public confidence in the integrity of the elective process, and of those whom it places in positions of public trust. If we fail in an area clearly calling for effective action, we will further diminish public confidence. In view of the firestorm of public frustration raging about us, this would be a serious breach of trust.

The measures before the Elections Subcommittee, H.R. 7612, S. 732, House Joint Resolution 559 and others, vary in their regulatory approach, their treatment of disclosure of campaign and personal finances, restrictions on spending and limitations on donations, and other specific provisions. I have attached hereto a summary of H.R. 7612 and a statement of general principles setting forth the parameters of the problem we must address. My principal purpose today is to focus on the basic relationship between money and election campaigns.

THE ADVANTAGES OF INCUMBENCY

Campaigning for major office has become almost invariably expensive. So whatever is done by way of limitations, we should not lose sight of the fact that reasonable opportunity to raise funds should be afforded those who seek election. For all their surface simplicity, proposals to restrict large donations without providing alternatives would merely eliminate one problem while injecting others.

One of the most troublesome to me is the array of advantages to incumbents. Our access to public communications media, our exposure through our own publications and mailing privileges, our staff resources, to name but a few influences perpetuating incumbents in office, are most formidable. The Committee on House Administration, on which I serve, has been responsible for many of them; I sometimes think too many. I imply no sinister purpose, but wish merely to point out that those resources we develop to equip ourselves better to function as legislators and serve our constituents have this inevitable result. Take the communications function, and that of representing constituents in their dealings with the Government. I regard them as absolutely essential to the performance of our function, while recognizing that they do have electoral implications, and unquestionably a self-serving potential.

It is axiomatic in American politics, furthermore, that support gravitates to the winner. Thus the incumbent, with all this array of built-in advantages provided at public expense, often finds them translated into ability to raise private campaign donations. It is hardly surprising, then, that such a low percentage of incumbents seeking reelection are upset at the polls.

A study by the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress has shown that between 1956 and 1972, House incumbents won in 3,350 races of a total 3,551 in which they ran, a percentage of 94.34. Comparable figures for the Senate showed 222 incumbents' victories out of 261 races, a percentage of 84.67. Another study, distributed by the Republican Research Committee, suggests that the taxpayers now invest more than \$600,000 to support the office of each Member of Congress over a 2-year term.

KEY ROLE OF SMALL CONTRIBUTORS

Thus challengers must be afforded an opportunity to make themselves and their positions known to the public. This takes money. I see corrupting influence less in the amount of money involved than in the degree of dependence on large donations. Money that comes in large bundles is too often tied with strings. To some, this amounts to an argument for whole-hog public financing of election campaigns as an alternative. But this would run counter to the direction reform should take.

One of the more encouraging trends in this country is a greater demand for participation by the average citizen in public decisionmaking. What more important decision is there than making the choice of elected officials charged with the responsibilities of government? We

should be strengthening, not weakening, individual choice. We should be encouraging the conscious decision to choose among candidates based on individual judgment of their qualifications. Often the act of contributing is the most direct opportunity open to the individual, beyond the act of voting, to express his will. We should preserve this, expand it, and give even greater leverage to the small individual contributor.

This is important to the selection process in that the ability to raise funds is at least one measure of a candidate's credibility and genuine public appeal.

DANGER OF TOTAL SUBSIDY

Public support for public financing of election campaigns is growing. But we must not overreact and fall into the typical trap of trying to solve a problem just by throwing the taxpayers' money at it. The costs would be enormous. The results disastrous. We would defeat our purpose and lower the esteem for the public officeholder and his works. There would rise the specter of politicians becoming somehow a breed apart; politicians who have figured out the combination and use taxpayer funds to lock themselves into positions of affluence and influence.

Given these considerations, wholesale top-to-bottom reform of the election process poses difficult problems of assuring that the means chosen achieve the intended ends. Last session we enacted partial reforms, which did not take effect until fund-raising for the 1972 campaign was well under way. We all recognize its deficiencies now. It had the effect of triggering large donations in advance of tighter reporting requirements. You can make a case that the abuses of Watergate stemmed partly from the large amounts of cash floating around. Some States which historically have imposed requirements more stringent than the Federal have found their efforts preempted or the process snarled in conflicting and overlapping requirements. It would be a travesty of the reform process to again generate similar unintended side-effects.

CURBING CASH

On the subject of cash, I have earnestly urged the Elections Subcommittee to consider an amendment prohibiting any candidate to accept any donation of more than \$25 in the form of cash. Similarly, all campaign expenditures for more than \$25 should be by check. This, in combination with tighter fiscal reporting provisions in the Clean Elections Act, would establish an auditing trail which would, by facilitating investigation, serve as a deterrent to questionable use of campaign funds.

In this regard, I was impressed by the proposal of Mr. STANTON of Ohio to establish a Federal election campaign bank, with all campaign income and outgo to be handled through accounts of candidates, political committees and other organizations seeking to influence the electoral process. Its additional roles of spot checking for compliance, prosecuting violators and informing the public also commend this approach.

Also worthy of attention is a proposal by our former colleague from New Jersey, Mrs. DWYER, to require all campaign contributions and other spending

transactions to be conducted through the use of serialized, computerized, special-purpose scrip. With space for such information as the identification and principal source of income of the contributor, the scrip device would provide for a total origin-destination tracking of the flow of money through the campaign process. While never introduced formally, language incorporating this approach is now before the Republican Task Force on Election Reform, along with a suggestion that it be subject to a year-long feasibility study.

SPENDING LIMITS—INCUMBENCY DIFFERENTIAL

One of the most difficult problems is raised by legislation to set maximum limits on permissible spending by candidates. It may be impossible to establish a figure that would be realistic in different parts of the country. Part of the problem is the question of establishing a differential between incumbents and challengers. While I know of no State which has adopted such legislation, we did wrestle with the problem in the 1950's when I was in the New Hampshire Senate, at which time I saw merit in the principle. I also note that such a differential is provided in bills sponsored by Mr. YOUNG of Illinois and Mr. KASTENMEIER of Wisconsin. One partial approach to the problem, embodied in last year's Anderson-Udall measure which I cosponsored, would have extended the franking privilege to challengers.

Another variety of problem is the difficulty of reaching a real consensus among 435 Members, each of whom has some exposure to the realities of campaign financing but few of whom can claim expert authority on the entire subject.

Yet despite the foregoing problems and others, the Congress must not forfeit the opportunity represented by current public concern in this matter. I, for one, have no desire to subject the public and the political process to another round of congressional and senatorial campaigns in the absence of further reforms, 2 full calendar years after Watergate. This argues for an approach which directly attacks the problem of undue dependence on large contributions and enhances private, individual participation in the process by the small contributor.

For too long the public has been witness to the spectacle of large contributors hedging their bets in national elections by donating substantial sums to opposing candidates, clearly implying anticipation of favors or fear of reprisals whatever the outcome.

THE CLEAN ELECTIONS ACT

Caution dictates that we build on this concept of small contributions as already launched through tax deductions and tax credits. The Clean Elections Act is a carefully crafted attempt to achieve these basic objectives of adequate funding, reduction of big-money influence, and strengthened participation by the small contributor.

Credit for small donations and Federal matching of small contributions represent a unique mechanism for sharing the burden of election costs between government and the concerned citizen. This is the great strength of H.R. 7612 and the weakness of the Senate bill.

The time for action is now, in this session, on this prudent proposal. H.R. 7612 and House Joint Resolution 559, which I am also cosponsoring, were introduced months ago. The Senate has passed one bill, which is now before the Elections Subcommittee, and is considering others. If a half dozen Members of the Senate can spend half a year on Watergate, certainly our House Administration Committee can devote the time and effort necessary to produce a bill for floor action before adjournment.

PROMPT ACTION AND PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

It has been said that all politicians, of both parties, have suffered a loss in public confidence. I have frequently pointed out that the abuses of 1972 were not the responsibility of the regular Republican Party, but unquestionably the two-party system has been severely damaged.

I think the public is trying to tell us that Watergate represented no monopoly on misdeeds and the entire electoral process needs a thorough overhaul. So regardless of how you spread around the blame of the past, the public will be rightly disposed to accuse us of complicity, after the fact, if we in the Congress fail to act and act promptly.

The modest approach embodied in H.R. 7612 should be launched immediately. An independent Federal elections commission, restrictions on campaign contributions, limited Federal matching of small contributions, a higher limit on tax credits for such donations and publicly financed television time for candidates should help meet our immediate needs.

Events of recent days have demonstrated the need for absolute impartiality, both in fact and in appearance, in enforcement of laws governing political contributions and other aspects of campaigning. I can conceive of no device better suited to this vital function than the independent elections commission we propose.

Another implication of this legislation draws on other lessons from the recent past. I refer to the exemption of national committees and the congressional and Senate campaign committees from the limitations on donations to candidates. This is intended to enhance the role of traditional party committees. I have pointed out in several statements to my constituents that the establishment, apart from the traditional party structure, of a separate Committee to Reelect the President was responsible for much of the debacle we call Watergate. Part of the problem was the enormous amounts of money floating loose. But another was the absence of normal restraints and respect for the rules of the game among a small and powerful group of people, none of whom were elected officials. A viable and responsible two-party system has been and is the life blood of our system of representative government.

NOMINAL REFORMS REJECTED

I emphasize that the limitations would still apply—\$1,000 in House and Senate campaigns and \$2,500 in Presidential campaigns—on individual donations to such committees. At the same time, I feel that the study commission

called for in House Joint Resolution 559 would complement the efforts of this committee, in view of our responsibilities for other legislative matters.

Reform in name will not wash. I can think of no greater contribution to cynicism among the public. I have been disappointed recently to find the House act in the name of reform and fall short of the mark. As a strong supporter or cosponsor of realistic measures in the war powers and anti-impoundment fields, I have been able to support the measures reaching the floor only with the greatest reluctance. But as regards campaign reform, the public is far more aware of the measures before us. The Congress is on trial. And particularly on trial are those who through the control of Congress control the destiny of this legislation.

INTIMIDATION THREAT

For those who find no other argument persuasive, it is useful to recall that campaign contributions accepted in all good faith can be subjected to misinterpretation by the public, a hostile newspaper, a demagogic opponent or even an ambitious prosecutor. In this regard I wish to share with you the comments of Senator FULBRIGHT before our Joint Committee on Congressional Operations in hearings on congressional immunity for legislators:

Among the biggest industries of my State are the poultry dealers. There are some large poultry companies. Or take the big rice people...

I vote for those people. I try to advise with them. I expect 90 percent or 100 percent of my votes are in the interests of the broker people, the cotton people, and the rice people. The people who are interested in rice contribute to my campaign. I do not know why.

If somebody in the Department of Justice felt I was a big enough nuisance, they would say, "Look, you got \$1,000 from such and such a rice company in Stuttgart and I notice you voted for their bill. You took that as a bribe." He does not have to prove it to put me in jail. The fact that I can be indicted and answerable in that forum is the significant part. I would not have to feel that I had been bribed or that I was guilty to be intimidated and be careful if somebody called me up and said, "Look, friend, you really are getting out of line. We know you have \$1,000 from them. Now, you had better calm down a little bit or we are going to have to bring suit."

To which I would only append the fact that the Supreme Court, in United States against Brewster, held that a bribery charge could be sustained against a legislator even if he defaulted on an alleged agreement and voted against a bill favored by the interests of the people said to have given or promised a bribe.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM ALSO NEEDED

Throughout this discussion I have sought to recognize the complexity of the problems we are addressing and to avoid extravagant claims for our Clean Elections Act. It also would be remiss to exaggerate the role of election reform standing alone. The best people, elected through the best conceivable process of selection can function in the public interest only to the extent that they are permitted to by the system. I happen to have a high regard for the great majority of my colleagues in this body. But it seems clear that those who deplore the electoral process are reflecting a large

measure of disillusionment with our performance as legislators and as a body.

What the public may view as unresponsiveness to the public interest is often the product of our procedures rather than excessive deferral to the executive branch or evidence of the baneful influence of special interests stemming from campaign contributions.

Thus election reform must be accomplished by reform of congressional procedures if we are to merit the full measure of renewed confidence of the public we seek to serve, and which the times urgently require.

I include the following:

FACT SHEET: MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE CLEAN ELECTIONS ACT OF 1973, COSPONSORED BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES C. CLEVELAND

I. FEDERAL ELECTIONS COMMISSION

Composed of six Member board, two each to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, President pro tem of the Senate and the President.

Terms would be for six years and not more than three of the members could be of one political party.

All functions delegated to the "supervisory authorities" (Clerk of the House, Secretary of the Senate and the GAO) by The Federal Elections Campaign of 1971 would be transferred to the Commission.

The Commission would be given powers to subpoena witnesses and compel evidence, and to initiate court actions against violators of the Act.

II. CONTRIBUTIONS LIMITATIONS

Contributions by any person or committee during any year would be limited to \$1,000 in the case of a candidacy for the House or Senate and \$2,500 in the case of Presidential candidates.

Candidacy is defined to include contributions to any candidate and all of his authorized campaign committees; no committee could receive contributions in behalf of a candidate without the candidate's prior authorization.

Contributions to any political action committee such as BI-PAC or COPE would be limited to \$2,500 per year from any single source. National party committees would also be covered by this limitation.

Disbursements to candidates by the national committee or Congressional and Senate campaign committees of each party would be exempted from the limitation on contributions to candidates.

III. PUBLIC FINANCING AND INCENTIVES FOR SMALL CONTRIBUTORS

The current tax credit for political contributions would be increased from \$12.50 to \$50 per taxpayer (\$100 in the case of a joint return).

Each candidate for the House or Senate in a primary or general election and candidates for President during a primary would be eligible for payments from the "Federal Matching Payment Entitlement Fund."

Payments would be in an amount equal to each contribution of \$50 or less received by the candidate or his committees. To receive these matching payments, the candidates would have to file periodic voucher statements with the Commission listing the contributions eligible for matching.

The national committee and the Congressional and Senate campaign committee of each party would also be eligible for matching payments in the same manner as indicated above.

No candidate or committee could receive matching payments for contributions from any single contributor of more than \$50 per year.

To limit Treasury liabilities, an upper ceiling of 10¢ per eligible voter is placed on pay-

ments to House, Senate and Presidential primary candidates, and \$15 million per year on the sum of payments to the National, Senate and Congressional Campaign Committees of each party.

To avoid a dissipation of Treasury funds on frivolous candidates, the bill requires submission of \$1,000 worth of matchable contributions for House candidates and \$5,000 for Senate candidates before any matching payment may be made.

IV. VOTER'S TIME

Provides half hour blocks of publicly subsidized television time to Federal candidates in general elections. This includes five half hour blocks for Presidential candidates, three blocks for Senate candidates, and two blocks for House candidates.

Time could be used for either debates between candidates or for individual appearances by the candidates.

V. MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS

Adds direct mail to the items (radio and TV, newspapers and magazines, bill boards, and telephone banks) covered by the 10¢ per eligible voter expenditure limitation in current law.

Requires each candidate to establish a "central campaign committee" which would collect reports of all other campaign committees of the candidate and file them with the Commission (rather than each campaign committee reporting directly).

ELECTION REFORM: STATEMENT OF BASIC PRINCIPLES, SUPPORTED BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES C. CLEVELAND

(1) Enactment of a mixed system of public and private financing of qualified candidates for President and Congress in general elections at a level which will enable a candidate to mount an effective campaign without the need to seek large private contributions. The amount must be sufficient to encourage the maximum feasible degree of competition in elections for Federal office, and there must be adequate safeguards to insure full and ready public accountability for the use of public and private funds;

(2) partial public funding for minor party, new party and independent candidates based on their performance in the last election or their showing in the present election;

(3) extension of the system to qualified primary candidates once they have demonstrated broad public support through some means, which might include raising a specified number of small contributions or collecting a number of petition signatures;

(4) establishment of meaningful limitations on large private contributions from any source in conjunction with the provision of public financing;

(5) incentives for candidates and political parties to raise private funds through large numbers of small contributors;

(6) provisions to assure a role for political parties which would allow them to serve as a legitimate pooling mechanism for private contributions to candidates in general elections;

(7) requirement of a central financial reporting and record-keeping checkpoint in each candidate's campaign for effective monitoring;

(8) administration and enforcement of campaign financial reporting and disclosure laws and regulations by an independent entity.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR FRANCO-AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. COHEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I am intro-

ducing today legislation to amend the Emergency School Aid Act to extend to Franco-Americans the same benefits afforded other minority groups under that act.

One of the purposes of the Emergency School Aid Act is to assist persons from environments in which the dominant language is other than English, and who therefore lack an equal educational opportunity. Statistics from the 1970 census show that there are over 89,000 residents in my congressional district who consider themselves Franco-Americans and who consider French to be their mother tongue. Though these individuals comprise 21 percent of Maine's elementary and secondary school population, only 2 percent ever enter college, while in the State as a whole 51 percent go on to college. Furthermore, results from a 3-year survey at one school show the dropout rate among Franco-Americans is 12 percent higher than the national average. Clearly, this situation must be changed.

Those of us who are fully matriculated into our monolingual, monocultural society find it hard to appreciate the problems which face the Franco-American or other ethnic groups. Educators know that exclusion from one's own cultural heritage and history, from one's language and community, can be so destructive to the self-confidence of a student that he gradually loses his ability to learn. Ethnic students must be able to relate their mother tongue to their personal identity, because language and the culture it carries are at the very core of a child's self-concept. The Franco-American is no different. Destroy this self-concept and you can destroy the child.

It is small wonder these children drop out of school, becoming prime candidates to receive future welfare support. By allowing this to continue, we are perpetuating a situation which prohibits these individuals from becoming productive and participating members of our society. Before the Education Amendments of 1972, which included the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program and Emergency School Aid Act, and the Bilingual Education Act, our priorities in this regard were in serious disarray. Previously, if an individual's productive capacity was blocked by denial of an equal educational opportunity, society compensated by introducing him to its largest losing proposition, welfare. We have since discovered the expediency of funding programs to prevent the atrophy of this productive capacity. Through such an investment, society is getting a return for its money by reducing potential welfare rolls and enjoying the tangible contributions of our ethnic groups. The Franco-American is no stranger to these facts. He needs some form of compensatory education which will provide the necessary tools to enable him to learn.

The Emergency School Aid Act was designed to deal with discrimination in our public schools. The Franco-American does not suffer from physical discrimination, but from a mental and spiritual discrimination which is far worse. He is held mentally captive by our philosophy of

the American "melting pot." This philosophy, far from accomplishing its professed aim of integrating ethnic groups into the mainstream of American society, has succeeded in denying whole generations of children an effective education, thus jeopardizing their access to that mainstream. We have discovered that mere physical integration is inadequate to remedy the discrimination suffered by the Franco-American child who speaks and thinks in one language and is asked to learn in another. All ethnic students have special educational needs which have impaired their ability to succeed in the English language environment of our public schools. No longer is it correct to assume that by providing a child with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum as other children that the child enjoys an equal educational opportunity. If that child cannot understand the medium in which the material is taught, he is effectively excluded from the education process and a victim of fundamental discrimination.

While we in America profess that we no longer follow our former melting-pot philosophy of cultural eradication, we must now move forward to a philosophy of cultural pluralism. How we answer the needs of the Franco-American and other ethnic groups is of prime importance. Our ethnic minorities are a natural link to other countries of the world. America's cultural diversity is an as yet untapped resource which may prove to be one of our best weapons for enforcing world peace.

Through this legislation, the Nation, for the first time, recognizes its sixth largest minority, the Franco-Americans. While ethnic groups much smaller in number were cited in the Emergency School Aid Act, I was amazed to learn that not only were Franco-Americans not mentioned in ESAA, but there exists no Federal legislation in which the 2,598,408 individuals who consider themselves to be Franco-Americans are described as a linguistically and culturally unique group.

The bill allows Franco-Americans to participate equally with the Nation's other recognized ethnic groups in programs of bilingual education, in new school curriculums of particular relevance and utility to the group, in training of professional staffs and teachers to help meet the specialized needs of Franco-Americans, and in formulating programs to bring cultural and ethnic relevance to community activities.

Admittedly, present programs provide only a fraction of the services necessary to accommodate the special educational needs of ethnic minorities. However, I believe this legislation is a step in the right direction. Maine's Franco-American population has provided valuable cultural contributions to our State, and my bill would provide them with additional tools that will enable them to continue to do so.

SUPPORTS EXTENDING DRUG EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of extending the Drug Abuse Education Act. This bill would authorize \$90 million over a 3-year period which would provide flexible and broad authority for support of drug abuse education, particularly in elementary and secondary schools and in local communities.

Mr. Speaker, America has always taken pride and offered encouragement to its youth. Yet, despite this emphasis on American youth, we are neglecting them at a time when they are under far greater threat than they have ever been before. That threat comes from the menace of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

Heroin addiction has become a national epidemic, a disease that has enslaved some 250,000 people in this country and last year killed more than 1,000 people in New York City alone.

The American public needs to be made aware of the harmful effects caused by drugs.

The number of youth in our country who use various forms of drugs is alarming. This is shown from a report issued by the House Select Committee on Crime on June 29, 1973, which stated:

Forty-five percent of New York City high school students, and 20 percent of its junior high school students are current drug users; marijuana usage in Pennsylvania secondary schools ranged from 9 percent in grade 7 to 28 percent in grade 12. Comparable figures for LSD usage in Pennsylvania schools were 8 percent in grade 7 and 13 percent in grade 12. Overall secondary usage of heroin was shown to be 8 percent.

We live in a dramatic age and we are rightfully concerned about drugs because they afflict the young and innocent and breed crime. If society does not take heed, place proper emphasis on the drug problem, and pull together to combat this form of corruption, there is no reason to suppose the fight against drugs will be successful.

Mr. Speaker, it is paramount that we mobilize every resource at our command to prevent still more people from becoming enmeshed in this vicious disease and let us do it before more of our children have blundered into the quagmire of drug abuse.

IN TRIBUTE TO JOHN SAYLOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of our good friend and distinguished colleague, John Saylor, this Nation has lost one of its foremost conservationists and legislators. Long before the concerns of environmental quality, preservation of our natural resources and protection of America's wilderness areas attained the high public profile they now hold, John Saylor labored as a dedicated crusader for the preservation of our natural heritage and for the realistic use of our dwindling resources.

Having known John as a personal friend and having known him for the faithful manner in which he devoted

himself to the individual concerns of the residents of his congressional district, I know he will be greatly missed.

During his long and noteworthy career in the House of Representatives, John Saylor coauthored such monumental pieces of legislation as the Wilderness Act, the 1965 Land and Water Conservation Act, and bills granting statehood to Alaska and Hawaii. In keeping with his concern for the mounting energy shortage, he was instrumental in ushering legislation through the Congress which created the U.S. Office of Coal Research. He was also a major supporter of the 1969 Coal Mine Health and Safety Act.

For his work, John Saylor was honored many times, by many civic organizations which recognized him as a man vitally concerned about the future of America.

For all his legislative milestones, however, I will best remember John for the example he set. Always attentive, always responsible and independent, he was a man of highest integrity. He was the kind of Congressman who practiced what he preached and put his words into action. We are fortunate to have known him, and all the richer for having benefited from his knowledge, leadership, and dedication to the principles of democracy.

I want to extend my sincerest sympathy to his gracious wife Grace and the Saylor family.

THE MULHOLLAND PARKWAY BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to establish the Mulholland National Scenic Parkway in my home State of California.

Fifty years ago, in 1923, ground breaking ceremonies were conducted above Sepulveda Canyon in Los Angeles for what was then called Mulholland Skyline Drive. It was to be a 24.2-mile scenic ridge route traversing the crest of the Santa Monica Mountains and extending from Hollywood, near the center of the city, to Calabasas in the Topanga Canyon.

Late in 1924 the roadway was completed and on December 27, 1924, a car caravan from Calabasas to the Hollywood Bowl highlighted a citywide, day-long celebration of the event. One Los Angeles newspaper reported at the time that Mulholland Skyline Drive was "destined to take its place as one of the famous scenic highways of the world."

In subsequent years, beginning in the area beyond Topanga Canyon Boulevard, an additional 30 miles of the roadway were added in Los Angeles County territory. This extended the Santa Monica Mountain thoroughway to a length of 53.5 miles, ending at the Pacific Ocean just south of the Ventura County line. The county extension was designated Mulholland Highway.

Today some 9 million people live in the valleys of Metropolitan Los Angeles below Mulholland Drive and Highway. Ninety percent of the population of the

City of Los Angeles lives within 15 miles of the roadway.

Significant action has been taken at several levels of government in recent years to protect and enhance public enjoyment of the remarkably varied daylight scenery on and adjacent to Mulholland, as well as the spectacular nighttime views which are unique in the world.

In October, 1971, Mulholland Drive was designated the first City Scenic Parkway by the Los Angeles City Council. At the same time a citizens' advisory committee was created to assist in shaping plans, design standards and criteria for the twenty mile route.

On March 6, 1972, the final report of the Ventura-Los Angeles Mountain and Coastal Study Commission endorsed the concept that Mulholland Drive "from Laurel Canyon to the Pacific Ocean" become a scenic parkway designated for recreational driving, with a low volume of traffic.

The second largest urban park in the United States—the 4,000-acre Santa Monica Mountain Urban State Park—was opened on July 1, 1973, bounded on the north by Mulholland Drive.

A wilderness park on what had been Nike base 96 on Mulholland Drive was projected by the city department of parks and recreation later in the summer.

This month the State department of parks and recreation announced plans to acquire 2,600 acres of Century Ranch which, quite likely, will become a State historic park commemorating the film industry in California. It has more than 2½ miles of frontage on Mulholland Highway.

Mulholland Highway near its terminal point at the Pacific Coast Highway exactly bisects the 1,600-acre Leo Carillo State Beach and its associated camping area in the Santa Monica Mountains.

Finally, the 120 acres of the world famous Hollywood Bowl—which is owned by Los Angeles County but operated under lease by the Southern California Symphony-Hollywood Bowl Association—are immediately adjacent to Mulholland Drive less than a mile from its midcity starting point on Cahuenga Boulevard.

In addition, two other major parks occupy the extreme easterly and the extreme westerly points of the Santa Monica Mountains. The 4,000-acre Griffith Municipal Park is within several miles of Mulholland and the observatory is clearly visible from the roadway. Point Mugu State Park, in Ventura County, encompasses 20,000 acres approximately 5 miles west of Mulholland on the Pacific Coast Highway.

Last year the 82-mile John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Memorial Parkway was dedicated in Wyoming. It became the sixth national parkway in the national park system under the direction of the Department of the Interior. I believe the Mulholland National Scenic Parkway should be the seventh and accordingly I am today introducing legislation to accomplish this.

The Mulholland Scenic Parkway plan would include the placement of additional secondary parks, picnic areas, parking cutouts, scenic overlooks, hiking

and labeled nature trails, bicycle trails, equestrian trails, and a network of hostels along the route. It would require the connecting of Point Mugu State Park and Griffith Park by a Mulholland trailway so that all major parks within the 250,000 acres of the Santa Monica Mountains will be linked along the 53.5 miles of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway.

The legislation would call upon the Secretary of the Interior to develop the Mulholland National Scenic Parkway in close coordination with the city and county of Los Angeles upon whose rights-of-way many of the land improvements would be made. Similar coordination would also be necessary with the California Department of Parks and Recreation which may also provide land segments and planning advice.

It is intended that the Mulholland National Scenic Parkway will augment and not supersede present and contemplated city, county, and State programs in the Santa Monica Mountains adjacent to the parkway. It is further intended that in association with State and local agencies, the National Park Service will initiate a program of road beautification along the 53.5-mile route. Not designed for heavy traffic use, the parkway will be itself a ribbon park enabling the people of southern California, and visitors from across the Nation, to more fully enjoy some of the most spectacular views in urban America.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the creation of a Mulholland National Scenic Parkway will constitute an impressive response to those who claim that the National Park Service is not making an adequate investment nor expending adequate energy in developing innovative scenic and recreational sites inside the population centers of the United States where maximum use and enjoyment are absolutely guaranteed.

H.R. 11163

A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Mulholland National Scenic Parkway in the State of California, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior may designate as Mulholland National Scenic Parkway the present Mulholland Drive and Highway rights-of-way, together with adjacent or related sites for public recreational use and for interpretation of scenic and historic values, commencing at the intersection of Pacific Coast Highway and running eastward along the crest of the Santa Monica Mountains to the intersection of the Hollywood Freeway.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, the donation of lands, interests therein, and other property comprising such right-of-way and adjacent or related sites as he may designate pursuant to this Act for the development, hereby authorized, of a road of parkway standards, including necessary bridges, spurs, connecting roads, access roads, and other facilities, and for the development and interpretation of historic sites and recreation areas, to include but not limited to, parks, picnic areas, scenic overlooks, hiking trails, bicycle trails, and equestrian trails, in connection therewith.

(b) Any federal property designated for purposes of the parkway may be transferred without a transfer of funds, to the Secretary for administration as a part of the park-

way with the concurrence of the head of the agency having jurisdiction thereof.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire lands by purchase or exchange that comprise the right-of-way and adjacent or related sites as he may designate pursuant to this Act. Whenever the purchase of land occurs, the Secretary shall purchase such property at a price which does not exceed its fair market value. Whenever an exchange of lands occurs, the federally owned lands exchanged therefor shall be approximately equal in value; except that the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of lands exchanged.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall administer the Mulholland National Scenic Parkway in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented. In the administration of the Mulholland National Scenic Parkway, the Secretary may issue revocable licenses or permits for rights-of-way over, across, and upon parkway lands, or for the use of parkway lands by the owners, lessees, or permittees of adjacent lands, for such purposes and under such nondiscriminatory terms, regulations, and conditions as he may determine to be consistent with the use of such lands for parkway purposes.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary shall coordinate development of the parkway in close coordination with Los Angeles City and County agencies and with the California Department of Parks and Recreation.

(b) The Secretary shall assure that the National Parkway Program will augment and not supersede present and contemplated City, County, and State programs in the Santa Monica Mountains adjacent to the Mulholland National Scenic Parkway.

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

ADDRESS OF GEN. YAKUBU GOWON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD, at this point, the statement of His Excellency, Gen. Yakubu Gowon, head of the Federal Military Government, Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of Nigeria, at the plenary session of the United Nations General Assembly on October 5, 1973. I particularly commend his trenchant comments on "the continuation of colonialism, racism and apartheid" in Africa so that "13 years after the adoption of U.N. Resolution 1514 on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, more than 30 million Africans spread over about one-sixth of our continent, continue to be denied their human rights, exploited and subjugated under minority, racist and colonialist regimes." General Gowon asks:

Thus denied constantly of their basic and legitimate rights, and bereft of all hope of change by an impervious and inflexible ruling class, is it any wonder . . . that the voice of despair is turning reasonable men who desire nothing but peace and progress to the frightful alternatives offered by constant frustration and loss of hope?

The full text of his statement follows:
ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY GEN. YAKUBU GOWON

Mr. President:
I am particularly delighted with this op-

portunity to address this august Assembly. * * * Today, I wish to reaffirm my country's faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations Organization. We in Nigeria believe that if all member states adhere strictly to the provisions of our Charter, as an earnest of their dedication to the ideals of our Organization, then we may yet accomplish that unique and bright promise for all mankind which the United Nations represents.

I am a strong believer in the United Nations Organization. I therefore find it rather disturbing that the image which some people tend to have of the United Nations is a misleading one of lack of dramatic success in dealing immediately with some of the major problems of peace and security, of human rights, and the degrading poverty of a large majority of the world's population. Proceeding from such a viewpoint, the conclusion is often heard that this organization is hardly any more relevant to our times. I do not share such pessimism, and I venture to suggest, Mr. President, that most Africans would not accept such a doleful assessment of the United Nations. We are all well aware of its shortcomings and its failings; but these are, in some measure, a reflection of the world which produced and now operates the Organization. It is necessary to seek to improve its effectiveness, but we in Africa hope that the member states of the United Nations should embark on such a process in a manner that would not do damage to this organization that is so vital to the vast, under-privileged, as yet developing, population of the third world.

For millions of such peoples throughout the world, the United Nations provides an indispensable forum for bringing to world attention, some of the problems that plague the world, and for which, all too often, no other means of solution are apparent. The United Nations can and does bring to bear the moral weight of world opinion on many a controversial issue. That explains its great value to the smaller nations and to the dispossessed and down-trodden peoples of the world. For example, it is clear that without the moral pressure exerted on colonial powers principally by this Organization, the struggle for self-determination and independence would definitely have been more difficult for many of the nations that are today proud members of the United Nations. Nor can we ignore the invaluable services rendered by the Organization and its specialized agencies in the vital areas of health, literacy campaign, child welfare and the championship of progressive labour legislation on a world-wide basis.

It cannot be over-emphasized that the primary purpose of the United Nations is "to save mankind from the scourge of war." Unfortunately, we have not always attained this lofty objective. There have been breaches of peace, such as in Korea, and Vietnam, with consequences no less dismal and harrowing for those affected. However, since 1945, there has been no *global war* such as mankind experienced to its horror during the first half of this century. It is to the credit of this Organization that even when conflicts do occur between nations in recent times, peaceful intervention by the United Nations has succeeded in arresting them. In other areas of the world, the United Nations continues to play a key and vital role in providing physical stability and preventing a deterioration of unhappy and unstable political and social conditions. It is, therefore, not unjustified, Mr. President, that we should look back on the 28 years of the existence of this Organization with some degree of satisfaction. The little measure of stability and hope that the world and its many peoples have been given these past 28 years, has been worthy of the long hours spent in this hall as well as in the chambers of the Security Council and other organs of the United Nations.

Of course, to acknowledge these areas of achievement of the United Nations Organization should by no means lull us into a sense of complacency. As in every human organization, there are areas of United Nations activities that cry out for urgent attention and improvement. Among these is the imperative need for correcting the structural and institutional deficiencies that hamstring some of its operations. When the Charter was framed, five nations were entrusted with the responsibility of "policing" the whole world. In the prevailing circumstances of those days such an arrangement might have been justifiable and acceptable. It is no longer so today. An urgent review of the decision-making processes in the United Nations system, taking into full account existing political realities, is long overdue. I need hardly say that one area of immediate concern is the increasing use of the veto in the Security Council in support of causes which seem to be in conflict with the noble objectives of the Charter. In this connection, it must be emphasized that African nations, and indeed most nations of the world, have been distressed at the constant use of the veto to block meaningful initiatives in matters relating to fundamental human rights, freedom and human dignity in many areas of the world and, in particular, in parts of Africa still under foreign or minority regimes. It is our hope therefore, that the nations which presently enjoy the privileges of veto power should use it responsibly in furtherance of world peace and the progress of mankind.

Mr. President, the Secretary-General has in his latest report, invited us to participate in a "constructive debate" about the future of this organization. It is my hope that in responding to this invitation all member states would advance proposals that would ensure that the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations are implemented by all member states.

The search for peace and security must be in a global context and must involve the active participation of all countries. We welcome agreements between the super powers in as much as these agreements lessen the fear and threat of nuclear warfare. However, we are compelled to call on the super powers to resist the temptation of limiting their negotiating spirit to only such issues as are of narrow interest to them and their people. We must insist that their negotiations and agreements which affect the fate of others should take account of the views of those concerned. For every nation and every country, great or small, rich or poor, has a stake in peace and security. It is therefore essential that each should participate, on the basis of sovereign equality, in resolving issues of concern to the whole world.

Mr. President, a few months ago the Organization of African Unity celebrated its tenth anniversary. I had the great privilege of presiding over the ceremonies and the tenth session of the Assembly of African Heads of State and Government. I should like, Mr. President, to convey an expression of the deep appreciation of the Organization of African Unity and all the people of Africa, to the United Nations Organization for the cooperation, inspiration and assistance that have continued to characterize the relations between our regional organization and this world body. We highly appreciate the constant interest of the United Nations as an institution, and the unfailing concern of the Secretary-General and the various agencies in developments in Africa and progress of the Organization of African Unity. All this is in keeping with the spirit of Article 52 of the Charter, which encourages regional organizations "consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations."

The Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights contributed significantly to the basis and the Charter of the O.A.U. Permit me, therefore,

to make some observations about how our regional organization has been addressing itself to the many problems confronting our continent.

The birth of the Organization of African Unity in 1963 was a great act of faith, and its response to the challenges of modern times has filled all Africans with joy and immense pride. After only ten years we have overcome some of the earlier impediments and difficulties in our way. Independent countries from all parts of Africa, with a variety of historical, political, linguistic and social backgrounds, are now united in our organization which has come to be recognized as the voice of our continent.

Of course, when we reviewed the various activities of the O.A.U. at that meeting we acknowledged that we had not achieved all our objectives. Indeed, it would have been difficult to achieve every single one of our aims and objectives in a short decade, given the uncertainties and unforeseen contingencies of world events. However, we have succeeded in consolidating our national independence, and in settling among ourselves and without distracting attention from outside Africa, many such intra-African disputes that have arisen. We have launched many economic and social programmes for improving the quality of life of our peoples in a spirit of self-reliance. We have brought the meaning of African unity and cooperation much nearer to each African's heart. We have continued to uphold, as central to the problems of our continent, the spirit of self-sacrifice, of compromise, and of reconciliation. We have pledged to redouble our efforts with a view to eradicating all forms of colonialism and racism from our continent, and thus assume control of our continent's destiny. Above all, the O.A.U. has symbolised the collective effort of the governments of Africa and their peoples to uphold forever the dignity and stature of the African in this world.

Mr. President, the problem posed by the continuation of colonialism, racism and apartheid represents the most intractable that has confronted us on the continent. Not only do colonialism, racism and apartheid constitute an unbearable affront on human dignity in the areas where these evils exist, they represent a great threat to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of independent African states and to international peace and security. Thirteen years after the adoption of United Nations Resolution 1514 on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, more than 30 million Africans, spread over about one-sixth of our continent, continue to be denied their human rights, exploited and subjugated under minority, racist and colonialist regimes. In defiance of world public opinion and in contemptuous disregard of the decisions of all international organizations of African unity, these regimes have fanatically frustrated and resisted all attempts at introducing constitutional changes designed to involve, in simple justice, the majority of the inhabitants of those lands in the processes that govern their destiny and their daily lives. Thus denied constantly of their basic and legitimate rights, and bereft of all hope of change by an impervious and inflexible ruling class, is it any wonder, Mr. President, that the voice of despair is turning reasonable men who desire nothing but peace and progress to the frightful alternatives offered by constant frustration and loss of hope? Can we wonder then that people are attracted, in such a situation to the painful alternatives of force and conflict? For our part in the O.A.U. we have no choice but to give whole-hearted support to the efforts of our unfortunate brothers to restore their legitimate right to self-determination and independence. In the words of the "Solemn Declaration on General Policy" adopted at our 10th anniversary session, "our support for the liberation struggle was adopted in response to the legitimate and profound

aspirations of our peoples and should be viewed less as a circumstantial community of interests than as an awareness of the common destiny of all peoples of the African continent."

At the same meeting, the African Heads of State and Government viewed with satisfaction the progress made in the decade since the establishment of the O.A.U. in the legitimate struggle of the peoples of Angola, Guinea Bissau and Cape Verde Islands, Mozambique, Namibia, Zimbabwe, the Comoro Islands, the so-called French Somaliland, the so-called Spanish Sahara, the Seychelles Islands and the Islands of Sao Tome and Principe. The struggle and the pressure, Mr. President, will continue in Africa until the stain of this degradation of human dignity has been removed and until the African, everywhere on his continent, can raise his head proudly in independence and self-determination and thereby be able to contribute his quota to world progress.

In this regard, Mr. President, let me commend to you and to members of this honourable assembly the bold and momentous step taken by the long-oppressed people of Guinea-Bissau and their political party in declaring their country independent. We in Africa believe that the struggle for final consolidation of the independence of this new nation will be much assisted by the practical support and cooperation which all men of goodwill and all who subscribe to the principles of the Charter of this Organization will extend, promptly and without hesitation, to the efforts of the rightful owners and peoples of Guinea-Bissau.

The Declaration of Independence by the people of Guinea-Bissau has received the overwhelming support of member states of the Organization of African Unity and of the friends of Africa. I should like, on behalf of Africa, to thank these friends for their prompt recognition accorded to this new state. It is our hope, therefore, that this new nation will shortly take her rightful position as a proud member of the international community.

The situation in Namibia, Mr. President, continues to be a source of considerable embarrassment and concern to this organization. I do not need to go over the various steps that have been taken by the United Nations and its competent organs to bring some rational solution to the situation created in Namibia by the intransigence of the racist regime of South Africa which still occupies that country illegally. The United Nations Organization has endeavoured to carry out its fundamental responsibilities to the hapless people of Namibia by repeatedly providing opportunities for a progressive and peaceful transformation of the situation in the country. It was the hope of many people in different parts of the world that the South African Government would, in its own wider interests, take advantage of the opportunities offered by the United Nations to fulfill its woefully neglected obligations to the people of Namibia.

But what have we found? The South African Government is intent upon defying the opinions of the world. Even after the International Court of Justice has expressed opinions which clearly indicated that the South African Government had no further moral or legal right to dominate Namibia. The South African Government continues to subject the people of that country to its fascist social and political system.

Mr. President, one is entitled to ask why it is that of all the territories that were entrusted to the colonialist powers under the trusteeship system, only in Namibia, the territory entrusted to South Africa, has this international trust been betrayed. All the other territories are today full members of the United Nations or on their way to independence. We in Africa strongly believe that

the United Nations and particularly the permanent members of the Security Council have a duty and responsibility to use all means at their disposal to compel South Africa to withdraw from Namibia and thereafter to assume control of the territory and to administer it until it attains full independence.

Mr. President, side by side with the steady pressure and progress in the efforts of the liberation movements in various parts of Africa, we witness with dismay the support that continues to be rendered by some nations to two member states of this Organization who have the dubious distinction in history of being the sole advocates of repression and colonialism and of racism. Also, the illegal regime in Salisbury still continues because of the non-compliance by certain member countries of this Organization with the unanimous decisions of the Organization and of mankind. Perhaps those who prefer to sell a few goods to such an illegal clique, or to buy such commodities as the racists of Salisbury wish to sell in order to maintain themselves in power, have made their own calculations and prefer their temporary material profit to their sense of honour and their position in history.

While on this subject, Mr. President, perhaps I should emphasise again the sadness of Africa in the face of the stubborn and unreasonable intransigence of these white regimes that continue to constitute themselves as enemies of Africa and of the Third World. Nobody in Africa, Mr. President, wishes to adopt the path of armed struggle and conflict against those minority regimes for the love of it. Nobody has asked that people who normally live in Africa and wish to consider themselves as part of Africa should, by any manner or means, be made to feel unwelcome. Those who are born and live and join us both in spirit and cooperation are welcome to live in Africa. For they are Africans. It is for this reason, Mr. President, that we made genuine efforts to assure the world of our desire for racial harmony on conditions of mutual respect and fundamental human rights of all the inhabitants of the continent. Is that not a message of hope for the colonialist and racist regimes? The Lusaka Manifesto which was presented to this Assembly three years ago by my dear friend and brother, H. E. President Ahmadu Ahidjo of the United Republic of Cameroon on behalf of Africa, embodied Africa's effort at working out a peaceful solution to the colonial and racial problems of the continent—problems which are not of our own making. What was the response? The colonialist and racist regimes rejected out of hand our peace offer and rewarded us with intensification of repressive laws in the areas under their control, massacres of our people, inspired assassination of the authentic leaders of the African freedom movements, and attacks on independent African countries.

Viewed therefore against the background of our efforts at initiating peaceful solutions, and the response we got, we are bewildered that several countries which claim to be friends of Africa continue to give such material and moral support to the colonialist and racist regimes, and to strengthen them in their oppression of our peoples.

Permit me, Mr. President, to appeal again on behalf of Africa to those who give support to our oppressors. It is time for all of us members of the United Nations to join hands in an effective and total isolation of the colonial and racist regimes in Southern Africa. It is time for us to tighten sanctions against the rebel clique in Salisbury. In addition, I appeal to the United Nations and the international community generally, to extend to the liberation movements and to the millions of Africans under severe oppression and exploitation, such material assist-

ance as would ensure fulfillment to the African peoples of the promise held out by the Charter of the United Nations.

Time is on the side of the African in the struggle against colonialism and apartheid. Victory is sure to be ours in the war against oppression and deprivation of individual liberty. But the United Nations and its member countries can render the process less painful and can help to make the road shorter by taking necessary steps before it is too late. By so doing, they would be contributing to the increase of peace and progress, in place of unhappiness and pain and suffering in the world.

Mr. President, during our 10th anniversary session, the African Heads of State and Government adopted another document of considerable importance. I refer to the African Declaration on co-operation, Development and Economic Independence. In the ten years since the O.A.U. was founded, we have observed that the promise of substantial economic development, leading to the path of economic independence, as contained in the Charter of the O.A.U., has not been marked by encouraging progress. On the contrary, the pattern has been one of continuing deterioration in the economic and social conditions of African and developing countries generally. The gap between us and the developed countries continues to grow even wider. Measures adopted during the last decade, we found, have been frustrated by other developments in the world at large, over which we have little say and no control. The terms of trade have constantly gone against us. World monetary arrangements have been made without consultations with us and without adequate consideration of our interests.

Faced with this situation and firmly convinced that our economic destiny must be taken firmly in our own hands, if noticeable improvement is to be achieved, African states solemnly proclaimed their determination to achieve the economic independence and development of the continent through the effective mobilisation of Africa's own human and material resources. To this end, we decided to accelerate the implementation of the Africanisation policy in each of our countries and to ensure effective and equitable African representation in international organizations.

Mr. President,

Bearing in mind the loss which Africa has suffered and continues to sustain through the foreign exploitation of its natural resources, we resolved to defend vigorously, continually and jointly, the sovereign rights of our countries to exercise full and effective control over our resources.

We believe that the time has come for the rich in this Organization to ponder seriously on the danger of being surrounded by so many poor. In their own self interest, if not for the sake of humanity in general, the rich nations should at least give us an even chance of pulling ourselves up. It is no longer our intention to go cap in hand to the door of the rich. What we want and demand is the opportunity for our own people to be afforded a chance of acquiring those skills and those elements of technology without which no decent and progressive economic system can be structured and maintained in the modern world. We have learned that we cannot expect help, at least, not in the order that would make a significant contribution to our own needs of development. But the older, more experienced and more technologically advanced countries can still do much to redeem the pledge they made to humanity and to this organization, by not putting impediments in our way, by less selfish and lopsided marketing arrangements for our own produce, and by facilitating our determination to utilise such resources as we have in the interest of our own people. I hope that

this session of the General Assembly will approve a constructive idea which emerged from the Algiers Summit of Non-Aligned states that a special session of the General Assembly, devoted to economic matters, should be held in 1975 when we shall be half way through the 2nd United Nations development Decade.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE JOHN SAYLOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in this Chamber in paying a special tribute to John Saylor, whose tragic and untimely passing has left an irreplaceable void in the House of Representatives.

For, Congressman Saylor was known by his friends on both sides of the aisle as "Mr. Conservationist." Since 1949, when John first came to this House, he has been a distinguished leader in helping to shape national policies in the areas of conservation, preservation of our country's natural and wildlife resources and environmental quality.

As the ranking Republican member of the Interior Committee John coauthored with former chairman, Wayne Aspinall, the Wilderness Act, that monumental legislation designed to save land from development, and the Land and Water Conservation Act. For all his tireless efforts and meritorious achievements in the field of conservation, Representative Saylor deservedly received the National Wildlife Federation's "Conservationist of the Year" award in 1964. Ten years earlier, he had been the first Member of Congress to receive the National Parks Association award in recognition of outstanding services on behalf of the U.S. National Parks and Monuments.

Congressman John Saylor's concern for conservation was not confined to natural resources. His greatest interest has been in the conservation of human life, and because of this concern, he has courageously persevered in the struggle for greater protection for coal miners and for increased benefits to victims of black lung disease.

To chronicle all John's legislative achievements in the field which has earned him the best claim in the House of Representatives to the title of "Mr. Conservationist" would certainly not do him the justice he merits in this area.

John Saylor was an amiable, popular Member of this Chamber, recognized for his sense of humor which often eased tense situations. I have known and appreciated Congressman John Saylor as a diligent and conscientious Member of the House, a man of great personal conviction, integrity, legislative responsibility, and independence. And I have known John as a Member who has served his constituents in the 12th District of Pennsylvania with great distinction, dedication, and purpose.

All of us who have served with Representative John Saylor are deeply saddened by his loss and my wife Milly

joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy and condolences to his family.

JOHN W. HEMPHILL, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, recently I was very saddened to learn of the untimely death of one of America's brightest and most able young newspapermen, Mr. John W. Hemphill.

At the time of his death Mr. Hemphill served as an assistant news editor for the New York Times here in Washington. It had been my privilege to know him for several years, commencing with his career as a reporter and former city editor for the Nashville Tennessean.

To those on the receiving end of his sharp and fearless questioning as a reporter Mr. Hemphill may have seemed somewhat of a journalistic demon at times. But to those who knew him personally he was a young man of tremendous warmth and selfless generosity. He will be remembered by his readers and his associates as a journalist first class. But perhaps more important he will be remembered by scores of kids as the soft-spoken, good-natured young man who helped organize and coach in the Pop Warner Football League in Nashville or as the quiet fellow who was instrumental in obtaining sponsors' support to purchase equipment for underprivileged children who could not otherwise afford to play.

Mr. Speaker there are too few men like John Hemphill, Jr. among us today and he will be missed. The Nashville Tennessean commented on Mr. Hemphill's death in an editorial of October 17, 1973, and I ask unanimous consent to include it in the RECORD at this point, commending it to the attention of my colleagues.

MR. HEMPHILL: NEWSPAPERMAN

Mr. John W. Hemphill Jr., an assistant news editor for the New York Times and former reporter and city editor for this newspaper, died in Johns Hopkins University Hospital yesterday at the age of 32.

Mr. Hemphill, a native of Alabama and graduate of Vanderbilt University, was an outstanding newspaper talent. He could write with tender feeling about the poverty stricken and disaster-hounded residents of the Appalachian mining regions. Or he could write with forcefulness of the injustice and indignity endured by the urban poor and powerless.

On one occasion he got himself committed to the Metro jail and work-house on a misdemeanor charge in order to investigate conditions there. The series of articles he wrote resulted in his nomination for a Pulitzer Prize.

He also covered the 1968 presidential primary campaign of Sen. Robert Kennedy, and later the murder trial of Sirhan B. Sirhan, Senator Kennedy's slayer. Later he collaborated with other staff members of the Tennessean in the authorship of a book, "A Search For Justice," a penetrating analysis of three major American criminal trials in a six-month period of 1969 and an examination of the "free press-fair trial" issue.

In the almost eight years that he spent on this newspaper, Mr. Hemphill was known

for his friendly, easy-going manner and a quiet toughness in the face of adversity or official obstinacy. The loss of such a personality and such a talent at such an early age is a tragedy.

THE PRESIDENTIAL STYLE OF LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the Government Activities Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, of which I am a member, has recently held hearings on the public expenditures at the private residences of the President.

These hearings were chaired by Representative JACK BROOKS of Texas. Congressman BROOKS provided most effective leadership in these committee hearings, and his probing questions elicited important information as well as searching exploration of the proper range and limits of public expenditures in this area. The committee was given excellent support by its staff, which assembled—against heavy odds—the necessary preparatory materials and background information essential to the analysis and recommendations the subcommittee must make.

The hearings raised several questions about the need for such enormous public expenditures on the private property of the President, as well as the apparently irresponsible manner in which the decisions to obligate public funds were made in several instances.

In many cases, the expenditures were clearly not necessary for Presidential security, but, because of inadequate public accountability, there was insufficient control over these expenditures. The hearings demonstrated that there is a pressing need for legislation or other appropriate guidelines to assure the accountability which is so essential to restoring public confidence.

Mr. Speaker, I insert an editorial from the Washington Post of October 29, 1973, concerning these important hearings:

THE PRESIDENTIAL STYLE OF LIFE

Rep. Jack Brooks (D-Tex.) and his government operations subcommittee are taking the right approach to the problem of excessive public outlays for the care and comfort of the President. It would have been all too easy for the subcommittee simply to carp about particular expenditures, or to bog down in squabbles over how much was spent on the security of previous chief executives, or to worry whether certain new windows and gazebos enhanced the value of Mr. Nixon's estates. Instead, Representative Brooks and his colleagues intend to offer legislation to inject real accountability into the whole process of providing security and support for the President.

The issue is much broader than the lawns of San Clemente or the beaches of Key Biscayne. The \$10 million or more that has been poured into refurbishing those two compounds is only a fraction of the total spent to maintain the chief executive's establishment. In the October issue of Fortune, Dan Cordtz tots up the perquisites which comprise "the monarchical style of life to which

U.S. Presidents have become accustomed." He concludes that the official White House budget of under \$13 million "ludicrously understates" the actual cost of the White House and its staff, the presidential courtiers, Camp David, entertainment, the presidential fleet of jetliners and helicopters, Mr. Nixon's array of offices, and the protection and communications required wherever the President may be. According to one budget analyst cited by Mr. Cordtz, the "true cost of running the presidency could be as high as \$100 million a year," with most of the monies buried in the accounts of other federal agencies.

What makes all this so unseemingly is the absence of restraint. Public money is spent too casually on little frills—a shuffleboard court of black-and-white terrazzo tile instead of concrete, a fence of redwood instead of wire and mesh. Presidential aides and documents are whisked about the country by government jet instead of less costly commercial flights. Expenditures have been ordered in Mr. Nixon's behalf by friends such as Herbert Kalmbach, with the bills sent to GSA. It adds up to a style devoid of modesty, proportion or thrift.

Congress has aided and abetted such extravagance by granting Presidents virtually unlimited access to public funds for the upkeep of their offices and establishments. Representative Brooks has outlined some reforms which the Congress should now enact. His list includes full disclosure of all spending for presidential security and support, the adoption of "orderly operating and accounting procedures" by the Secret Service and GSA, and legislation to prohibit outside parties from ordering items for the chief executive and billing the government. The congressman is interested as well in setting limits on the amounts which may be spent on the private property of Presidents. But the most important item on his agenda is also the one that cannot be legislated—a requirement that the President himself "show more responsibility" in his demands on federal agencies and public funds. The point of such reforms is not primarily to save money or tidy up the books, but to restore to the conduct of the presidency a sense of proportion and propriety which has been lost along the way.

THE 81ST ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST SLOVAK SOKOL SOCIETY IN THE U.S.A.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, October 30 is the 81st anniversary of the first Slovak Sokol Society in the United States, which was organized in my own city of Chicago in 1892. This fine organization counts more than 23,000 members across the Nation and for the past 81 years, it has made an outstanding contribution toward the development of individual strength and physical fitness of all Americans through gymnastics.

"Sokol" means falcon—a bird that has strength, courage, agility, and a love of freedom. Sokol physical education stresses individual initiative and creativeness and provides conditions for the development of the individual. Sokol gymnasiums and Sokol activities provide a training ground where each one can, according to individual strength and skill, develop oneself to higher standards of achievement in physical fitness. Self-discipline, a basic requirement for personal achievement, enables the gymnast

to become a cohesive and cooperative member of the American society.

Sokol U.S.A. is composed of hundreds of lodges in the United States, which are divided into 16 districts. Administrative and gymnastic activities are directed by officers who are elected on local lodge, district, and national levels.

The culmination of the physical fitness program is the National Gymnastic Sokol Festival—Sokol Slet—which takes place every 4 years, usually in conjunction with the National Sokol Convention.

The festival—Slet—consists of competitions in gymnastics, sports and calisthenics, with mass exhibitions of rhythmic calisthenics, apparatus, games and national dances, performed by gymnasts from all the Sokol U.S.A. lodges. The mass calisthenics, which are a major part of the Sokol physical fitness programs, are performed to music, and are a beautiful part of the Slet program. Participants are children, junior boys and girls, and senior men and women. The age span is great, from 3 years of age through the sixties, and even beyond.

In uniting the American heritage, and the Sokol ideals, in the hearts and minds of its membership, Sokol U.S.A. contributes greatly to the welfare, safety, and freedom of the United States. It was for this reason that last year I introduced the bill which authorized the President to proclaim October 30, 1972, as "National Sokol Day" in honor of the 80th anniversary of the first Slovak Sokol Society in the United States. I am certainly gratified that my bill was overwhelmingly adopted by the House and Senate and became Public Law 92-486, which facilitated appropriate festivities and ceremonies across our Nation in celebration of this event.

Mr. Speaker, the assistant chief physical directress of Chicago Sokol Lodge 306, and of the national organization, is Mickie Chilla; the supreme court president is Adolph Cierny; the District L Stur physical director is Bob Chilla; and the District L Stur physical directress is Mickey Schramek. I commend them for providing outstanding leadership for their organization.

It is an honor for me to join the members and officers of Sokol Lodge 306, District L Stur, in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois which I am privileged to represent, and Sokol members all over the United States as they celebrate this anniversary. To the members of the Sokol U.S.A. I say, Nazdar—on to success—as you maintain your high standards of excellence and example to all Americans "that to achieve a free nation, its people must be physically and morally strong."

REINTRODUCTION OF SOCIAL SERVICES AMENDMENTS OF 1973

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I join my many colleagues today in cosponsoring the Social Services Amendments of 1973. The

battle over the social service regulations has been widely discussed, but I would like to touch on some aspects of the battle, for I believe it illustrates quite clearly how the administration has sought to ramrod its policies upon the country without paying any heed to the voices of its citizenry or its elected Representatives.

Last February HEW issued a set of regulations that would have cut the heart out of the social services program begun 13 years ago by Congress. The proposed regulations would have reversed the thrust of the program by confining incentive to getting on welfare and staying there. In addition, the range of services a State could provide was restricted, and the use of private funds for matching purposes was prohibited.

All this, from an administration that claimed to believe that more authority and decisionmaking should be returned to the States. The same administration that claimed to be in favor of work, and in favor of reducing the welfare rolls. Congress was painted as wanting to give away the National Treasury to provide outrageous services to people who do not want to work anyway. The administration postured itself as the stalwart guardians of frugality in the midst of free-wheeling spenders. They were fiscally responsible, we were not.

The administration never mentions, of course, that Congress had imposed a spending limit of \$2.5 billion for social services last year. Nor did it bother to mention that HEW was directed by Congress to write the regulations so as to implement congressional policy. Somewhere along the line they got the idea that they were to write regulations that would implement their policy, not our policy, not the policy of the American people, but the policy of the Nixon administration.

We will never know if the administration was "shocked" by the storm of protest that erupted after the February regulations were announced and that has been renewed each time they have issued "revised" regulations. There does seem to be some indication that this administration is particularly lousy in judging what America wants and what it will put up with. We do not know if the administration was prepared to make some minor concessions all along, in hopes of cooling whatever fires did erupt. I suspect, however, that HEW was prepared to "tough it out" from the beginning.

The battle lines were clearly drawn back in February, then. The administration on one side, with regressive regulations that would subvert the congressional intent of the social services program, and Congress and the people on the other, trying through the appropriate, at least the usual, channels, to negotiate some sort of accommodation.

The 10 months I have been privileged to serve in this body have been 10 of the most tumultuous months in American history. I am not going to try and catalog all the events we have witnessed—we all know them well, and besides, by the time I finished speaking there would well be some new developments that would render any such list incomplete, if not inoperative.

A constant chord that has been struck by the administration throughout these 10 months however, has been that we in Congress have not been doing our job, that we have been dwelling on the various events and have therefore been negligent in performing our duties in "getting on with the business of the Nation."

With the reintroduction of the Social Services Amendments of 1973 today, we in Congress are culminating a battle over the social service program that has been going on for 9 of those 10 tumultuous months. It is a battle that we have waged in every arena available—on the floor of Congress, in the Democratic caucus, before the Senate Finance Committee, in private meetings with administration officials, and through countless letters and telegrams. Today we are forced to act out through the legislative process what many of us have been trying to accomplish through these other channels.

Perhaps if we had known 9 months ago how difficult it is for this administration to accept a compromise, we would have legislated immediately. But there were many of us who could not believe that the administration could shut their eyes and ears to the hundreds of thousands of letters protesting the regulations and to the demonstrated, mandated intent of Congress. No; we in Congress have not been guilty of not getting on with the business of the country. If we are guilty of anything, it is probably our failure to recognize earlier the complete intransigence and arrogance of the present administration.

What has happened since February is that Congress really has been working, and working hard. Nowhere has this been more apparent than in the social services battle where we have repeatedly tried to effect a compromise, to try and bring the administration and HEW into a policy position which is consistent with congressional intent and to hold them to some sort of public accountability.

We have failed up to now, but again, it is not for want of trying. It is not because we have been immobilized by current events. We have had meetings with HEW: they have received hundreds of thousands of letters; they have been contacted by major organizations whose memberships represent millions of Americans; we have had congressional resolutions and congressional hearings; we have delayed implementation of the regulations and asked HEW to go back and try again, try to write those regulations so we would not be forced to write them for you. Do your part, we have said, because we are trying to do ours.

Well, I say they have failed, and I say they have not been doing their jobs. I say it is appalling that we have spent 9 months trying to work out this issue with them, and they have refused to even listen. Apparently it does take an act of Congress to get anybody's attention in the administration.

So, I am joining with many of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in cosponsoring the Social Service Amendments of 1973. As you know, this is companion legislation to a bill introduced by Senators MONDALE, JAVITS, PACKWOOD, BENTSEN, and 27 other bi-

partisan Senators in the Senate. It has been attached to the Welfare Technical Amendments in the Senate Finance Committee. A conference committee will be called to negotiate the differences between our bill and theirs. I hope that the members of that conference will act expeditiously. We have already wasted too much time in fighting this battle that should have never taken place.

CHILD ABUSE

The Social Services Amendments of 1973 is above all a positive and constructive means of rescuing the social services program from the administration's regressive regulations. One of the positive goals fostered by this legislation is a matter of special concern to me: The problem of child abuse and neglect.

The amendments address this problem by setting forth as one of the family care goals of the social services program the prevention of neglect, abuse, and exploitation of children, and by amending title IV-A to include multidisciplinary programs for the identification and treatment of abuse children and their families as one of the services that can be offered by the States as part of the AFDC programs. The bill also exempts protective services, which is the major vehicle for current federally funded child abuse efforts, from the 90-10 matching requirement established for title IV-A protective services programs by Public Law 92-512.

In the past months I have been pursuing a legislative solution to the problems of child abuse, and on March 29 introduced the Child Development and Abuse Prevention Act, H.R. 6389, which now has over 70 cosponsors. I am gratified that Chairman JOHN BRADEN in the Select Education Subcommittee has already held 2 days of hearings on this legislation, October 1 and 5. The Senate, under the leadership of Senator MONDALE, passed the bill on July 14.

The main thrust of H.R. 6389 is to develop a national focus on child abuse and neglect, and to make immediately available demonstration grants to fund treatment and prevention programs. These grants would be available to both public and nonprofit private agencies on a competing basis, and would go to any agencies that have made a commitment to improving current approaches to the problem. The grants could be used for comprehensive multidisciplinary programs, or other innovative approaches. In addition, the legislation would establish a national center to coordinate research, training materials, and information on current programs, and a national commission to revise the model reporting law and to study the proper long-range role of the Federal Government in assisting State and local governments.

As work on this legislation progressed, several points have become clear. One is that there is an overriding need for immediate funding of treatment programs. Cases of abuse and neglect too horrible to imagine are being reported daily. And effective means of treating these cases are being developed by individual groups throughout the country. The tragedy of the situation is that funds are just not available to treat what is coming to be

recognized as one of the most devastating childhood diseases.

It has also become apparent that there is a need to strengthen and redirect the efforts of State child welfare agencies funded under title IV-A and IV-B of the Social Security Act. The Social Services Amendments of 1973 tangentially reaches this problem. I am at this time introducing further legislation, which I hope will be adopted as part of the amendments, to require that State agencies, in order to continue to receive funding for protective services under title IV-B, the State must establish:

Procedures for the discovery and reporting of instances of neglect or abuse of children;

Cooperative arrangements with all community agencies and resources dealing with child abuse;

A systematic method for receiving child abuse reports on a 24-hour basis; and

A central collection point for all data on child abuse and neglect.

The bill would also require that the States, in their statutorily mandated plans for AFDC, must include, in addition to the currently required reporting of child abuse and neglect, such multidisciplinary services as necessary to aid the prevention, identification, and treatment of child abuse and neglect.

State protective services agencies are also in need of more funding. I am delighted that the Senate in passing the Labor-HEW appropriations bill increased by \$15 million the amount currently available for all title IV-B child welfare programs. This is an increase from \$46 to \$61 million over the administration's budget request and over the House-passed bill. It is my sincere hope that the House will agree to this important Senate addition.

ISRAELI WAR PRISONERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ABZUG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, because of my concern for Israeli war prisoners, I communicated yesterday with Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, asking him to raise with representatives of the Arab nations the issue of humane treatment, including visits to prison facilities by the International Red Cross. I also asked that he urge acceptance of the Israeli offer of an immediate exchange of prisoners of war, and the release of an updated list of prisoners being held.

The Secretary of State told me that the United States had already sent messages to that effect and stressed:

You can be absolutely sure that I will raise this issue urgently.

He advised me that Egypt had made assurances that it would produce a list of wounded prisoners at a meeting with Israeli army representatives.

He said:

But I'm not sure they've done it. They've promised it.

Assistant Secretary of State Joseph Sisco, with whom I also talked on the

phone yesterday, said that the Government views the prisoners question as "a No. 1 issue—on which we ought to be able to achieve results."

Today's press accounts state that Egypt has agreed to an immediate exchange of wounded prisoners of war. Defense Minister Dayan says there is reason to hope that Egypt will submit the names of all its Israeli prisoners to the International Red Cross and will permit Red Cross visits to the prisons.

The State of Israel has already issued a list of Arab prisoners, has provided access to them by the International Red Cross, and has offered an immediate exchange of prisoners to Egypt and Syria. In view of the past treatment that Israeli prisoners have endured under Arab detention, it is a matter of highest priority that their rights be respected under provisions of the Geneva Convention and international law.

I feel that these events of the past few days are important steps in the negotiating process, and I will continue to urge that we the United States use its best offices to achieve these demands concerning prisoners for they are just and equitable.

THE KILLING OF THE PRESIDENCY

(Mr. WAGGONER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, if we, as Americans, are really interested in our country's well-being—and clearly we all should be—then recent events surrounding this administration must be viewed in as objective a light as is possible. Unfortunately, for most of the American people, this has been extremely difficult to do given the national news media's rather blatant attempt—for whatever the reason—to manipulate public opinion against the President. I seriously doubt if many people could have withstood the kind of press barrage we have seen directed at him.

It is, therefore, refreshing to read editorials that do attempt to restore some balance and to place the events of recent days into proper perspective. One such editorial, which was broadcast over radio stations KEEL and KMBQ in my own congressional district this weekend, has just come to my attention. As food for thought, I urge my colleagues to carefully peruse "The Killing of the Presidency" by the most able Mrs. Marie Gifford, which follows my remarks at this point:

THE KILLING OF THE PRESIDENCY (By Marie Gifford)

Over the last ten years we have seen a gradually accelerated effort to kill the presidency.

I am not speaking of a physical assassination, but rather of a gradual tearing down of the highest office in the land so that whoever occupies that position is rendered ineffectual, and thus incapable of carrying out his proper duties.

The easiest way to do this is, of course, to ridicule and insinuate great wrongdoing on the part of whoever the President may be.

We saw this happen in the case of Lyndon Johnson. A play was even produced off Broadway, a take-off on Shakespeare's "Macbeth", insinuating that President Johnson was a modern-day Macbeth and his wife a modern Lady Macbeth. Certainly President Nixon has suffered even more from such insinuations.

I submit that this is a dangerous game to play. Not that honest criticisms or differences of views should not be aired, for these United States thrive on honest differences and a freedom of speech.

But there is a difference between freedom and license, a difference between truth and complete truth; a difference seemingly not understood by some politicians and some news media.

It is right to decry Watergate, but it is more truthful to decry such practices on all political levels and by all political parties, for the politician or newsmen who denies that such practices ever before existed is either hopelessly naive or a liar.

To even discuss impeachment of the President is ridiculous. No present proof exists that he has broken the law. Furthermore, a major network on Monday of this week made a survey of both houses of Congress to find out how many Congressmen and Senators favored impeachment. The poll was overwhelmingly against impeachment, so, the network simply did not release the poll.

These who would kill the Presidency have laughed at the idea of Executive Privilege. I am old enough to remember an angry President Truman invoking just such executive privilege and telling a young Congressman from California by the name of Nixon to figuratively "go to hell" when Congressman Nixon asked for White House memoranda when he was on the Congressional Committee investigating Alger Hiss.

I also remember the "The New York Times" and the "Washington Post" and other news media editorially congratulated the then President on his stand on keeping the Presidency inviolate.

But today it has become great sport to belittle the President. Whether or not those who engage in this sport realize what they are doing, I do not know, nor do I suggest that it is a conspiracy. But they are killing the Presidency as surely as a bullet killed John Kennedy.

Such actions as have been taken by overseas nations in the past 7 days would not have been taken had the leaders of those nations not felt that the American Presidency was so weakened the United States could no longer be a potent force in keeping world peace.

I do not believe this is what the great majority of Americans wish for their country. I do not believe we Americans wish the Presidency to be killed.

It is thus time that we speak up strongly and say that we will have no more of this death by insinuation and innuendo. Let the courts take care of matters properly belonging in the courts. Let Congress get back to the business of Congress. And let the games politicians play be held off until the next election when everybody knows they are games.

The stakes are too great for power-hungry politicians, and yes, sorrowfully, power-hungry newsmen, to kill the Presidency. But unless we Americans speak, it will be too late.

Voice your opinion now. Send your cards, your letters, your telegrams to your Congressmen. They need your support to prevent the killing of the Presidency.

"SOME GOOD-NEWS MAKERS" BY STANLEY R. TINER

(Mr. WAGGONER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at the point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, National 4-H Club Week was observed Sunday, October 7, through Saturday, October 13. While events on the national and international scene tended to overshadow its observance, an article which appeared in the October 13 edition of the Shreveport Times, one of the daily newspapers in my district, and which was written by the paper's chief editorial writer, Mr. Stanley R. Tiner, did focus on this most worthwhile organization and the role it plays in molding the youth of this Nation into respectable, productive citizens. I think Mr. Tiner's article is excellent; and I will not, therefore, attempt to explain in my own words the importance of this organization. There is, however, one point I would like to stress.

While 4-H Club activities do enrich and enhance the lives of the young people they encompass and the club's contributions throughout the years to our American way of life are immeasurable, the key to the success and effectiveness of 4-H Club work does not hinge on its accomplishments. The success of this organization lies in the dedication of countless adults across this country who have given of themselves and their time to emphasize the importance of club work, the community, our country, and world. They put meaning into the words:

I pledge my head to clearer thinking, my heart to greater loyalty, my hands to greater service, and my health to better living for my club, my community, my country, and my world.

Youngsters throughout this land repeating this pledge in unison represent America at its finest. I truly believe that the spirit of 4-H is manifest in the grass-roots of America and that it is so because adults throughout this country dedicated themselves to its purpose and ideals. My comments, coupled with Mr. Tiner's article which I now submit for insertion into the RECORD, represent a meager effort on my part to say "Thank you."

SOME GOOD-NEWS MAKERS (By Stanley R. Tiner)

This is National 4-H Club Week. "Yahoo," you say, as you quickly plan to move on to something important like what's happening on the Golan Heights, or what did the prime interest rate do lately.

Before you dismiss the subject so quickly, however, consider this:

There is no better place for a young person to reach the understanding of real life than in a 4-H Club.

Four-H Clubs are one of the good-news vehicles of youthful enterprise alive in this or any other country and 4-H clubbers are one of the real solid resources going for America as we approach the last quarter of this frenetic century.

REFRESHING CORNINESS

There is still an old-fashioned corniness about these kids and their club that is refreshing. When was the last time you saw a group of well-scrubbed faces in the same room pledging their heads to clearer thinking, their hearts to greater loyalty, their health to better living and their hands to greater service to their club, their community and their country?

That's the kind of pledge you'll hear on just about any day you get a group of 4-Hers together; and what's more, they mean it.

Through the more than six decades that 4-H Clubs have fed good citizens into the American system, club work has remained basic. It has, like a constant in our society remained true to the colonial ethos that moved this nation down the road to democracy.

Virtues like hard work and honesty are extolled today in 4-H Club work even as they were in the days past when local men, such as the late N.C. McGowen, were moved to contribute generously to such a movement.

Four-H clubs have produced many of this generation of farmers, including most of the new breed of college-educated business- and scientific-oriented young farmers that dominate the hill-country beef, dairy, and cotton crops of Northwest Louisiana.

It has produced, too, many who wear the white-collars of business and professional life who walk the concrete of Shreveport and other cities, better equipped for their work because of the 4-H experience.

FEELING OF OBLIGATION

Many lawyers, veterinarians, accountants, store owners and others came out of those days imbued with some feeling of obligation to God, country, and other assorted old-fashioned ideals.

Even editorial writers have come through those 4-H Club days with fond memories and a feeling of indebtedness to those parents, teachers and club leaders who gave of themselves to make that program go for another generation of youth.

Those memories go back to the 4 a.m.'s up and feeding, walking, and brushing a raw-boned Hereford calf still yearning the mother's milk he has been denied in weaning.

And to a too-tender moment in Baton Rouge, as a 12-year-old away from home for the first time, at the spring livestock show, and the just-dawned reality that "Amos" the Angus was about to go to the packing-house. In that fleeting second of goodbye Amos, looking up with big luminous black eyes, licked that 12-year-old on the cheek, authoring the salty wetness of loss.

But Amos, Andy, Kingfish, Elvis, Edsel, and all of the rest became digits in a ledger book of a young country businessman that would spell college someday. They were a part of the growing-up lessons of 4-H.

STAYS WITH TRADITION

Four-H, in these rapidly changing times, has not made the mistake of abandoning hard tradition. The farm programs, that have benefited millions of rural youth through the years, are still there but there is a strong 4-H movement in the direction of bringing more of the city boys and girls into the program.

So in the brick valleys and glass-walled fences of Shreveport, young people are increasingly being brought into 4-H work through modern-day programs that teach them such things as how to eat nutritional meals on a poor man's paycheck, or how to mend clothes, or to do a lot of things that people need to know.

But, still, threaded through all of this is the anthem of love for country and dedication to values that are old, but not outdated.

And because of what they have done so well for so long, the 4-H leaders and members of our area of the world deserve a salute and the admonition to keep up the good work.

WATERGATE AND A DANGEROUS WORLD

(Mr. WAGGONER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, in the event any of my colleagues missed seeing the editorial in Sunday's Star-News, "Watergate and a Dangerous World," which will be included in the Record at the close of my remarks, I would urge that they read it. It is, I feel, an accurate summation of the events which took place beginning over a week ago with Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox's announcement that he would not accept the tape compromise which had been agreed upon. Its well-thought-out conclusion is worthy of note:

WATERGATE AND A DANGEROUS WORLD

This was, as they used to say, the week that was, and it will be perfectly all right if we do not have another like it in the immediate future.

It all began, against the backdrop of a major war in the Middle East, a week ago Saturday, when Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox held a nationally televised press conference in which he rejected the Stennis compromise which would have furnished expurgated versions of nine Watergate tapes to both District Judge John J. Sirica and to the Senate Watergate committee. Cox told the nation that he would bring a citation for contempt against the President in Sirica's court.

Later that day, with the inevitability of Greek tragedy, Mr. Nixon forced Attorney General Elliot Richardson's resignation and fired both Cox and Deputy Attorney General William French Smith. Meanwhile—with time out, of course, for the Redskins to destroy the Cardinals—the Israelis continued to expand their bridgehead west of the Suez Canal, imperiling the Egyptian Third Army dug in on the other side of the waterway.

On Monday, as the United Nations accepted a joint U.S.-Soviet Mideast truce plan, Mr. Nixon's domestic situation began to unravel. Western Union was deluged with telegrams calling for his impeachment and the Hill was seething with outrage.

Tuesday brought a sharp about-face on Mr. Nixon's part, as his lawyers told Sirica that the nine Watergate tapes would be surrendered to him. But this abrupt reversal did nothing to still the cry for the President's political hide. Indeed, as it sunk in on the Senate and the public that the President's surrender of the tapes to the court had negated the bargain with the Watergate committee—and hence made it virtually certain that less rather than more eventually would be known about his part in the Watergate coverup—the pressure on the Oval Office increased. Perhaps not entirely incidentally, the Mideast truce broke down almost before it had taken effect, as the Israelis raced southward to seal off the Third Army.

On Wednesday, House Democrats decided to pursue and broaden an inquiry into the possible impeachment of the President. In the Senate, Republican leaders who had stood by Mr. Nixon throughout the Watergate crisis urged the appointment of a special prosecutor to replace Cox, a step to which the President was at that time adamantly opposed. Mr. Nixon scheduled, then canceled, an address to the nation.

In the small hours of Thursday morning, after a 3 a.m. emergency meeting of the National Security Council, American forces were put on a middle-level worldwide alert in the face of an apparent Russian threat to intervene unilaterally in the Middle East to save the doomed Egyptian Third Army. Secretary of State Kissinger, in performance as virtuoso in its own way as had been Cox's, spoke in grave terms of the threat posed to world peace by the Russian demarche. It is perhaps symptomatic of the cancer which afflicts us that he was met with insinuations that perhaps the alert was designed

less to forestall the Russians than to extricate Mr. Nixon from his Watergate difficulties, perhaps at the cost of democratic government in this country.

By Friday, although the alert was still on, the international crisis appeared to have eased considerably. Although Russian personnel had arrived in Egypt in unknown numbers, the Kremlin had agreed to a U.N. cease-fire force which would exclude the major powers, and fighting in the Mideast had decreased in intensity.

There was still more to come Friday night. At his press conference, Mr. Nixon's feud with the news media escalated to its highest peak yet, and his announcement that the administration would appoint a new Watergate prosecutor to succeed Archibald Cox, after all, hardly pacified his critics in Congress. Although most liberal Democrats and many pundits also continued to cry for the impeachment of the President, however, there was a discernible sigh of relief from other quarters that, seemingly against considerable odds the country had at least survived one of the most tumultuous weeks in its history.

And indeed if there is a lesson to be learned from those wild seven days in October, it is that, as Kissinger observed in his press conference, there always is a price to pay for a prolonged and strident convulsion of the political system. And when one is talking in terms of a nuclear war in which millions are certain to die, the price of instant righteousness can be higher than the average man wants to pay.

We are not suggesting for a minute that, given the stench of Watergate, Mr. Nixon's personal finances and political acts are not legitimate subjects of public concern. If it can be proved conclusively that he has been guilty of speculation or of the gross abuse of his constitutional powers, then there can be no alternative to his impeachment.

But insofar as we are aware, Mr. Nixon has broken no law, defied no court, padlocked no legislature, muzzled no member of the press. The jackboots that some observers seem to hear echoing in the streets of Washington are largely in their own minds.

The new special prosecutor of the Watergate case will have a responsibility to the public to follow every trail wherever it may lead. And the House has the obligation to act on this and other information in the ascertainment of Mr. Nixon's fitness to lead the country.

But as events of last week show, this is a serious business and those who embark upon it must be aware of the possible consequences of their acts. If only because other nuclear-armed nations have an immense capacity to misinterpret what happens here, with possibly terrible results for all mankind.

In short, we could use a little more gravitas in the treatment of the President of the United States. There has been far too much slander, innuendo and loose rhetoric about Mr. Nixon's possible deeds and presumed motives. He has yet to be found guilty of anything other than having underlings and associates accused and some guilty of misdeeds. Nor is he, insofar as we know, mentally unbalanced, an insinuation which some have made.

Let the investigation of his administration continue. Let the House, if it feels it must, pursue the question of whether he has been guilty of the "high crimes and misdemeanors" which can be the only basis for his impeachment. But, as someone once remarked, it would be helpful if all of us would "lower our voices" a bit. It would be useful if some of the President's more hot-eyed critics would examine their own motives. It would be realistic to keep in mind that there is a world beyond Bebe Rebozo and Robert Vesco.

Thinking men used to hold that the blood of kings can be shed, but never lightly. Rich-

ard Nixon is not our monarch but he is our president, and the only one we happen to have. To destroy him out of pique, at the cost of destroying the nation, would be a shallow victory for some and a defeat for all.

A PRAYER FOR AMERICA THAT REASON WILL REIGN

(Mr. WAGGONER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, one of the best editorials which I have read concerning the Cox dismissal and subsequent events appeared in the Shreveport Times for Wednesday, October 24. It sets forth the facts of the case in a clear and concise manner.

A conclusion which it draws, and properly so, is that the "air of uneasiness and apprehension prevailing in America in the wake of this weekend's actions is not so much the result of what has happened as it is the result of the hysteria that has been unleashed on the Nation." Finally, it appeals to all to use reason and not emotion when considering the facts of this case.

In the emotion surrounding the Cox case, there are some rational voices in the news media; and I certainly take my hat off to the Shreveport Times for its appeal to reason in this instance. For the benefit of my colleagues, I am including the aforementioned editorial in the Record at this point.

A PRAYER FOR AMERICA THAT REASON WILL REIGN

A rush to judgment concerning the monumental events of this past weekend would be the most errant course that could be pursued by the American people or their elected representatives in Congress.

Rather than a prejudiced decision of quick emotion the national reaction should be one of careful study of all of the available facts.

This is a time for nobler instincts to prevail and for the abandonment of partisanship. It is a time for fairness so that the Republic's good might be served.

These comments of philosophy are ordained, of course, by the growing list of momentous decisions coming from the White House, congressional response to those decisions, and the constitutional crisis that looms large in America's future as a result of these conflicts.

The immediate reaction to all of these events is a reaction spawned, in the main we think, by the accumulative weight of a largely liberal national media, and loudly outspoken leftists in public life. The combination of these factors has made it to appear *prima facie* that the President's actions are somehow outside the bounds of correctness and unworthy of his high office.

Comments about the President's firing of special Watergate prosecutor Archibald Cox and Deputy Attorney General William French Smith have been largely intemperate, shocking and lacking in the responsible vein needed during such a time.

It should be immediately noted that those very voices clamoring for presidential resignation or impeachment are the same partisan voices of radicalism that have lent their service to the deterioration of America through the years.

What we are seeking in this country, at this time, is a reversion to an unbecoming brand of banana republic politics.

The national prayer must be that reason will reign out of the confusion of this day.

In arriving at the correct view of what is

happening, it is proper to review certain facts.

The President, in conjunction with the chairman and vice chairman of the Senate Watergate committee, was properly moving toward a solution to the difficulties that had placed the nation on a course of historic conflict between the Executive and Judicial branches of government.

Their agreement to have an independent party, Democratic Sen. John Stennis of Mississippi, to authenticate material on the White House tapes of private conversations was altogether appropriate and should have been satisfactory to all parties interested in the larger good of the nation as well as the simple truth of the tapes. Sen. Stennis has a record of impeccable integrity which made him unquestionably qualified for the role for which he was chosen.

It was at this point that special prosecutor Cox became intransigent and continued to press toward an appeals course that would have placed the President and the Supreme Court in a destructive battle.

The President then, quite properly, had Cox fired and the firing process ended in the resignation of Atty. Gen. Richardson and the firing of his deputy, William French Smith.

All of these actions were perfectly within the constitutional rights possessed by the President. Under the circumstances prevailing on Saturday, it is clear that the President acted not only within the framework of the law but under his elective mandate to place the American good as his chief motivation.

The air of uneasiness and apprehension prevailing in America in the wake of this weekend's actions is not so much the result of what has happened as it is the result of the radicals' hysteria that has been unleashed on the nation.

The actions of the country's political liberals have been little short of criminal as they have pressed for the destruction of this President and perhaps with him the presidency and democratic government.

All of the familiar voices have been raised and widely disseminated to the people. Ambitious Ted Kennedy, openly lusting for the office to which President Nixon was elected by the American people, appeared on the CBS morning news only Tuesday to darkly hint with rumor and innuendo that somehow the President is guilty of some mysterious and unspoken crimes. All of the other liberal automatons have predictably lent their voices in a cacophony of noise, including AFL-CIO President George Meany, who apparently feels compelled that in order to accept his \$90,000 per annum lifetime salary that he must bellow out on every issue, whether the nation wishes to hear him or not.

But it was Hawaii Democratic Sen. Daniel Inouye who perhaps let the cat out of the bag best. Speaking before the AFL-CIO convention meeting in Bal Harbour, Fla., Sen. Inouye said that President Nixon should get out of office or be removed. He then urged that the House speaker, Democrat Carl Albert, move up to the presidency.

Thus it becomes clear that we are moving in the direction of the majority party in Congress, the Democratic party, now openly seeking to replace a President who is a member of the minority party. This is perhaps the most dangerous partisan activity in the history of these United States, and it should be recognized for what it is by the American people.

The world today lies on the balance of perilous times. Even as the brouhaha was being raised to impeach Richard Nixon, the fruits of his international diplomacy were arranging peace in the Middle East.

The Nixon peace initiatives which have led to detente with Russia and China were the groundwork on which the badly needed cease-fire was constructed. It is that same diplomacy that allowed America to disengage

from Vietnam and bring the boys home from an unpopular war.

This is the President elected by an overwhelming majority of the people to serve his nation for a second term. This is a President who has done more than any living man to establish world peace. This is a President who through his record of service has proven himself.

RETIREMENT OF JAMES J. ROWLEY

(Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, announcement of the retirement this week of the Honorable James J. Rowley as Commissioner of the U.S. Secret Service heralds the ending of a 35-year career for one of America's all-time outstanding public servants. Commissioner Rowley became Commissioner on September 1, 1961, having worked his way up through the ranks.

It is with deep regret and a feeling of personal loss that I have received this news. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that handles the Secret Service budget, I have had the privilege of knowing and working with Commissioner Rowley in a wide variety of matters of greatest importance and concern to our Nation.

Jim Rowley began his career with the Secret Service in 1938 in New York. He came to Washington in 1939 and was assigned to the Presidential protective detail at the White House when Franklin D. Roosevelt was our President. He became head of this detail in 1947 and served there until his elevation to Commissioner in 1961.

Mr. Rowley's service on the White House detail was marked by many historic events. During World War II he played a key role in protecting President Roosevelt while in residence, during extensive travels within the country and on the occasions of the President's trips abroad for conferences with allied leaders at Casablanca, Tunis, Cairo, Tehran, and Yalta.

During President Truman's administration he was in charge of the advanced detail of agents which set up security for the President at the Potsdam Conference, and it was while he was in charge of the White House detail in 1950 that the attempt on the life of President Truman by Oscar Collazo and Griselio Torresola was thwarted.

Following the election of President Eisenhower, Mr. Rowley was in charge of the detail which accompanied the President to Korea. During the Eisenhower administration, he made many trips abroad to direct personally the planning of security of the Chief Executive during thousands of miles of travel to many countries.

During his 12 years as Director, the Secret Service went through a major reorganization which followed the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. This was followed by the great expansion of the Service, a fourfold increase in agents, to meet its new protective responsibilities, including protection of visiting dignitaries and Presidential candidates.

Concurrently, the modern methods of

printing suddenly made counterfeiting a much more prevalent activity, and the Service has moved vigorously on that front to seize millions of dollars of counterfeit money before it is ever passed on the American public.

It was also during Mr. Rowley's tenure that a special firing range which was to be established for the Secret Service grew into the concept and now the reality of the Consolidated Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, which will train enforcement agents and officers from 23 Government agencies.

The increasing tensions of the times, which expanded the protection of persons by the Secret Service, also extended to its role in physical security; and it was under Mr. Rowley's leadership that the White House police force was expanded into the Executive Protective Service, which now provides physical security not only for the White House but for foreign missions in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

In short, Jim Rowley's years as Director have been historic for the Nation and the Secret Service. The growth of the Secret Service has reflected, perhaps more than any other, the tenor of the current age. His job and responsibilities were enormous; and he fulfilled them with dedication, sound judgment, and leadership that has given the Secret Service a high degree of esprit de corps and a willingness to do its job and do it well.

Because I think all of us in this body, and the entire Nation as well, owes Mr. Rowley a debt and deep appreciation for his service, I want to take this means of announcing that I am urging Secretary of Treasury George Shultz and his associates take the necessary steps to name the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center the James J. Rowley Training Center, or some suitable title having for its purpose the honoring of this great public servant. Having been in charge of the budget work at the time, I can assure the Secretary and my colleagues that had it not been for the unceasing efforts and urgings of Commissioner Rowley this great institution for training would not have come in to being. It literally is his "brain child." Its worth is demonstrated every day.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of my colleagues join me in wishing Jim and his lovely wife Mable all the best in their retirement years.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BREAUX (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today and October 31, on account of official business of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. VEYSEY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. WALDIE (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today and October 31, on account of death in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHUSTER) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KUYKENDALL, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. SYMMS, for 60 minutes, on November 7.

Mr. CLEVELAND, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. COHEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BELL, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP, for 30 minutes, today.

Mrs. HOLT, for 60 minutes, on October 31.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MEZVINSKY) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. O'NEILL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FUQUA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FULTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CULVER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHUSTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska in two instances.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

Mr. SARASIN.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. SEBELIUS.

Mr. HOGAN in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. COHEN in three instances.

Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. RONCALLO of New York.

Mr. BAUMAN in three instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK in four instances.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. MCCLORY in two instances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. MALLARY.

Mr. MARAZITI.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri in two instances.

Mr. CRANE in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MEZVINSKY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROUSH in three instances.

Mr. BENITEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. FISHER in three instances.

Mr. REUSS in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. EILBERG in 10 instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. STUDDS.

Mr. DELLUMS in five instances.

Mr. WOLFF in four instances.

Mrs. BOGGS.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. STOKES in four instances.

Mr. FUQUA in three instances.

Mr. HENDERSON in two instances.

Mr. MCCORMACK.

Mr. REID.

Mr. HARRINGTON in five instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. WALDIE in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 31, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1487. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish an improved program for the benefit of producers and consumers of extra long staple cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1488. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish improved programs for the benefit of producers and consumers of peanuts and rice; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1489. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on negotiated contracts for experimental, developmental test or research work, or industrial mobilization in the interest of national defense, covering the period of January-June 1973, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1490. A letter from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the views of the Commission on S. 607, an act to amend the Lead Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 2076(k) (2); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1491. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report on Export-Import Bank approved loans, guarantees and insurance in support of U.S. exports to Yugoslavia, Romania, the U.S.S.R., and Poland during the period of July and August 1973, pursuant to section 2(b) (2) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FULTON: Committee on Ways and Means, H.R. 6642. A bill to suspend the du-

ties of certain bicycle parts and accessories under the close of December 31, 1976; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-611). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ULLMAN: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 7780. A bill to extend for an additional temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarns of silk; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-612). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. NEDZI: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 10840. A bill to amend the act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 411), to provide salary increases for members of the police force of the Library of Congress. (Rept. No. 93-613). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 672. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11104. A bill to provide for a temporary increase of \$13 billion in the public debt limit and to extend the period to which this temporary limit applies to June 30, 1974. (Rept. No. 93-614). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 673. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 9107. A bill to provide increases in certain annuities payable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 93-615). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 11162. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 11163. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Mulholland National Scenic Parkway in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11164. A bill to amend section 203(e) (2) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 to extend for 1 year the period during which the determination of the extended benefit period with respect to any State may be made without regard to the 120-percent requirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 11165. A bill to amend the Emergency School Aid Act to extend to Franco-Americans the same benefits afforded other minority groups under that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 11166. A bill to amend title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 to prohibit age discrimination in any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11167. A bill to establish two awards in recognition of service in the line of duty by public safety officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GINN, Ms. JORDAN, Mr. REID, Ms. SCHROEDER, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BLATNIK, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BRADENAS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mrs. CHISHOLM, and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 11168. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide the States with maximum

flexibility in their programs of social services under the public assistance titles of the act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mrs.

COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CULVER, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUIGO, Mr. DENT, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FULTON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, and Mr. HEINZ):

H.R. 11169. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide the States with maximum flexibility in their programs of social services under the public assistance titles of the act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCPADDEN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. METCALFE, Ms. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOOREHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NIX, Mr. O'BRIEN, and Mr. PEPPER):

H.R. 11170. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide the States with maximum flexibility in their programs of social services under the public assistance titles of the act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SISK, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. YATES, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. YOUNG of Georgia):

H.R. 11171. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide the States with maximum flexibility in their programs of social services under the public assistance titles of the act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 11172. A bill to provide for the appointment of a Special Investigator/Prosecutor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 11173. A bill to insure the enforcement of the criminal laws and the due administration of justice; establish an independent Special Prosecutor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 11174. A bill to provide that the special cost-of-living increase in social security benefits authorized by Public Law 93-66 shall take effect immediately; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself and Mr. HELSTOSKI):

H.R. 11175. A bill to enforce the provisions of the 14th amendment to assure the proper conduct of elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JORDAN:

H.R. 11176. A bill to authorize in certain cases the appointment of a Special Judicial Prosecutor and Investigators to assist grand juries in the exercise of their powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAZEN (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. FISHER):

H.R. 11177. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and

maintain the Cibola project, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

H.R. 11178. A bill to provide emergency security assistance authorizations for Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCCORMACK (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. MELCHER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. PODELL, Ms. JORDAN, Mr. POAGE, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WARE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. ROBINSON of New York, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. CONTE, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. ANNUNZIO, and Mr. COLLINS of Texas):

H.R. 11179. A bill to provide for the early commercial demonstration of the technology of solar heating by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in cooperation with the National Bureau of Standards, the National Science Foundation, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and other Federal agencies, and for the early development and commercial demonstration of technology for combined solar heating and cooling; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MCCORMACK (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. REES):

H.R. 11180. A bill to provide for the early commercial demonstration of the technology of solar heating by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in cooperation with the National Bureau of Standards, the National Science Foundation, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and other Federal agencies, and for the early development and commercial demonstration of technology for combined solar heating and cooling; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MARAZITI:

H.R. 11181. A bill to provide for the early commercial demonstration of the technology of solar heating by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in cooperation with the National Bureau of Standards, the National Science Foundation, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and other Federal agencies, and for the early development and commercial demonstration of technology for combined solar heating and cooling; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MIZELL:

H.R. 11182. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to eliminate the inclusion of agricultural credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 11183. A bill to regulate closing costs and settlement procedures in federally related mortgage transactions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOAKLEY (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 11184. A bill to provide for extension of the term of the Watergate grand jury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARRIS (for himself and Mr. BAFALIS):

H.R. 11185. A bill to amend title II of the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (Public Law 92-500); to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 11186. A bill to extend for 3 years the District of Columbia Medical and Dental Manpower Act of 1970; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 11187. A bill to provide for a 10-percent across-the-board cost-of-living increase

in social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKLE (for himself, Mr. Eckhardt, Mr. FISHER, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. WHITE, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. POAGE, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. CASEY of Texas):

H.R. 11188. A bill to provide for the establishment of an American Folk Life Center in the Library of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PREYER:

H.R. 11189. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States over certain civil actions brought by the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 11190. A bill to provide for the appointment and duties of an independent Special Prosecutor relating to offenses allegedly committed by the President, Presidential appointees, or members of the White House staff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.R. 11191. A bill to establish an Office of Special Prosecutor, to investigate and prosecute any official misconduct with respect to the 1972 election for the Office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York:

H.R. 11192. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$3,000 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SARASIN (for himself, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DENT, Mr. HENDERSON, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 11193. A bill to impose a 6-month embargo on the export of all nonferrous metals, including copper and zinc, from the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER:

H.R. 11194. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for prevention, identification, and treatment in cases of abuse or neglect of children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 11195. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to strengthen the regulation of futures trading, to require public disclosure of certain information relating to sales of commodities, to bring all agricultural and other commodities traded on exchanges under regulation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEELMAN:

H.R. 11196. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide the States with maximum flexibility in their programs of social services under the public assistance titles of the act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 11197. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to increase the per diem, transportation, and travel expense allowance of Farmers Home Administration county committeemen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 11198. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide premium pay for employees for time in an on-call status away from their duty posts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 11199. A bill to establish an Office of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to assist in the development and demonstration of rural health care delivery models and components; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHBROOK (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BAUMAN, and Mr. BLACKBURN):

H.J. Res. 801. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to force and effect of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.J. Res. 802. Joint resolution to insure the separation of Federal powers and to protect the legislative function by providing a procedure for requiring Federal officers and employees to inform the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H. Con. Res. 371. Concurrent resolution to censure the President without prejudice to impeachment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H. Con. Res. 372. Concurrent resolution relating to national priorities; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina:

H. Res. 670. Resolution directing the Committee on the Judiciary to prepare a compilation of information and evidence tending to prove or disprove the commission of any act by Richard M. Nixon which amounts to an impeachable offense; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Res. 671. Resolution to create a select committee to consider an impeachment resolution against the President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

343. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Milton B. Sparks, Menard, Ill., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

344. Also, petition of the Board of Church and Society, United Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., relative to impeachment of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

345. Also, petition of John P. Tucker, Jr., Charlottesville, Va., and others, relative to impeachment of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SIGNIFICANT GROUNDBREAKING CEREMONIES HELD FOR MODEL SECONDARY SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, October 30, 1973

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Wednesday, October 17, 1973 I was privileged to join with our First Lady Mrs. Richard Nixon, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare Caspar Weinberger, Mayor Walter Washington, and Miss Nanette Fabray in the ceremonies marking the occasion of the groundbreaking for the Model Secondary School for the Deaf in Washington, D.C.

With us on the platform were several students of the school, who participated in the groundbreaking and pledge to the American flag. It was most appropriate that the ceremony, like the school itself, was student oriented. Several hundred youths were in the audience.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the program together with the re-

marks of the speakers be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the program and remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MODEL SECONDARY SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF
GROUNDBREAKING, OCTOBER 17, 1973

ABOUT MSSD

The Model Secondary School for the Deaf was established in 1966 by P.L. 89-694 after a study of education services for the deaf by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare revealed few genuine secondary programs for young deaf students existed in the United States. Charged by Congress to be both a regional high school and a national model, the MSSD continuously develops and evaluates new teaching techniques and materials which, if found to be valid, are disseminated to schools for the deaf throughout the nation.

Upon completion of the new facilities, which were designed by Hudgins, Thompson, Ball and Associates, the MSSD can accommodate up to 600 students from its primary service area of the District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania and Delaware. The American Construction Company is general contractor for the project.

The MSSD is located on the Gallaudet Col-

lege campus and is operated under an agreement between the College and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

PROGRAM

Musical Selections: United States Marine Band.

Presiding: Dr. Doin E. Hicks, Director, MSSD, Dean of Pre-College Programs, Gallaudet College.

Welcome: Dr. Edward C. Merrill, Jr., President, Gallaudet College.

Pledge of Allegiance: Valerie Parsons, MSSD Student.

A Proclamation: The Honorable Walter E. Washington, Mayor-Commissioner, District of Columbia.

Greetings from the White House—Mrs. Richard M. Nixon.

Remarks: The Honorable Caspar W. Weinberger, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; The Honorable Jennings Randolph, U.S. Senator, West Virginia; Miss Nanette Fabray, Co-Chairperson, National Advisory Council on the Handicapped.

Groundbreaking—MSSD Students: Robin Edwards, Stephen Gasco, Galinda Goss, Thomas Holcomb, Ivy Mathews.

National Anthem: Reginald Boyd, MSSD Student.

Interpreters: The Rev. Rudolph Gawlik, Dr. Henry Kloppe, Dr. Lottie L. Riekehof, Mrs. Shirley Stein.